

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER;

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

XLVIII. Vol. II. No. 21.]

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20TH, 1841.

[PRICE THREEPENCE.]

CONTENTS.

Lord Brougham's Speech	217	Texas	224
Holland	219	Cuba	225
Slave Trade on the Barbary Coast	220	Mauritius	—
Slavery in British India: Lord Auckland's Minute	221	Bombay	—
Abolition of Slavery in Tunis	223	Dublin	—
Hints to Foreign Correspondents	224	The Coolie Slave Trade	229
LEADERS: Deputation to Lord Aberdeen	—	Cuba	—
Lord Brougham's Speech..	—	Slavery in Brazil	230
		Texas	231
		Accounts of Central Emancipation Committee	232

Advertisement.

Just published, in One Volume, 8vo., Price Ten Shillings and Sixpence to Subscribers.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION, held in London in June, 1840.

"The Anti-slavery public are laid under deep obligations by the care and industry which have been bestowed upon this report, which appears to be full and faithful, and is elegantly printed. It is a monument of benevolent feeling."—*Patriot*. "The work is one of thrilling interest, and will be read with eagerness by every friend of human liberty and human happiness. No man interested in the question of slavery ought to be without it—and we may add no man who has it and reads it can be otherwise than interested."—*Nonconformist*. "The *Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention* is a bulky octavo of nearly six hundred pages, containing a full report of the sittings and subjects discussed at the meeting held in London last summer."—*Colonial Gazette*. "This volume contains a very full and faithful record of the proceedings; we regard it as a volume which will possess increasing interest for centuries to come."—*Christian Examiner*.

Also price One Penny, or Five Shillings per Hundred.

THE SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD BROUGHAM, on the liabilities of British subjects to the penalties of the law for holding and trafficking in slaves in foreign countries; and on SLAVERY IN BRITISH INDIA. With illustrative Notes.

London: Thomas Ward and Co., Paternoster Row; British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 27, New Broad Street; and all other Booksellers.

Parliamentary Proceedings.

HOUSE OF LORDS, OCTOBER, 5, 1841.

THE SLAVE TRADE.

LORD BROUGHAM.—I rise to call the attention of your lordships to a subject of very great importance, and upon which, as there happily exists no difference of opinion either in this or the other House of Parliament,—and as there prevails, indeed, a singular unanimity regarding it in every part of the country,—it will be the less necessary for me to trouble you at any considerable length. The subject to which I refer is the slave-trade and slavery. I believe that there exists in no part of either House of Parliament, or of the community, any description of persons who feel any but the strongest desire to see this most execrable traffic universally and instantly destroyed; and also to see the state of personal slavery itself as universally, and with all practicable expedition, extinguished. The ground upon which I deem it necessary to trouble your lordships, upon the present occasion, is, that great misapprehension has, apparently, gone forth, touching the state of the law with respect to the slave-trade as it at present stands. I presented a petition to your lordships, some ten or twelve days ago, which contained a variety of important allegations upon this matter. I then distinctly stated that the responsibility for the truth of those allegations must, of course, rest with the respectable petitioners who brought the subject before the House; but that, if the facts which they stated turned out to be true, it would follow that, to a large amount, the capital of this country was embarked not only in continuing slavery in foreign countries, but actually in upholding, and even extending, the slave-trade itself. I thought it expedient, in going over the different statements which that petition contained, to specify those dealings which I understood, from the best attention I could give the subject, to be not contrary to the existing law—those dealings which I conceived to be of a doubtful character—and those which are clearly and distinctly prohibited—some of the statements describing acts as having been done, and as still doing by British subjects, which acts, without any doubt whatever, are prohibited by the laws of this country.

I shall begin with the last class of these dealings, namely, those alleged to have been entered into by British subjects, and which are clearly quite

illegal. The law is, that any British subject, in any part of the world, whether in a country where the slave-trade is lawful, or in a country where the slave-trade is not only allowed, but protected and even encouraged by the law,—if, except on some savage coast, there be such a country,—the slave-trade, if engaged in by a British subject, is, in that person, illegal—a felony and piracy, punishable with transportation for life, if committed on the high seas, or within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty; punishable with transportation for fourteen years if committed in any place out of the Admiralty jurisdiction. For several years the offence of slave-trading, if committed within the Admiralty jurisdiction, was a capital felony; but, by an act passed four years ago, it has been reduced to transportation for life; though it is still piracy as well as felony. If committed elsewhere, by a British subject, though in a colony or a country where slave-trading is ever so much permitted, and even favoured by the law of the place, it is a felony in that British subject; he is liable to be tried, if taken and brought to a settlement of the British crown, or if taken and brought into this country, he is liable to be tried for that act of slave-trading, as if it had been committed in the county of Middlesex; and, on being convicted, he is liable to be transported as a felon for fourteen years. Having distinctly stated this, I trust I shall not again hear my opinion cited, to show that it depends on the law of the foreign country where a British subject resides and commits the act, whether he be guilty of felony or not; whereas I have always expressly stated, that the law of the foreign country is utterly immaterial as regards British subjects; and it is equally certain, no doubt, that if a foreigner commits an act of slave-trading within any of our dominions or settlements, he is also liable to be dealt with as a felon, and transported for life or for fourteen years, according as he may have committed the offence within or without the Admiralty jurisdiction. The only question that can ever arise is, whether any given act amounts to slave-trading or not. Now, several of the acts described in the petition do not, as it appears to me, amount to slave-trading; some of them appear of a doubtful character; others appear quite clearly to be slave-trading, and to come within the provisions of the abolition law. If a person fits out a vessel to traffic with a slave factory, and if he sells goods to that slave factory, although these goods may be used in the slave-trade—although they may be of such a kind as can either be used for the slave-trade, or for the innocent commerce of Africa—if they are sold out and out for a price, I do not think that this amounts to slave-trading. Whether it be a commendable use of capital is an entirely different question—whether it be a kind of trade which one would wish to be engaged in, or could approve of on those who drive it, is another matter; but, as regards the law of this country, it does not appear to me to be slave-trading within the meaning of the Abolition Acts. If the goods sent are of such a description that it is by no means doubtful whether they are to be used in slave-trading or not;—if, for instance, a cargo of fetters and shackles be sent out to a slave factory, or any other article which can only be used in the slave-trade, this may be more questionable;—but I am not prepared to say that even this is an act of slave trading which would make the exporter liable to a charge of felony: it appears to me to be, as the law now stands, of a doubtful description. But, if either one kind of goods or the other—either goods that may be used indiscriminately in the innocent and in the guilty commerce, or goods that must needs be intended to be used in the slave-trade by the slave factory to which they are exported—are bargained to be paid for in a price, to depend on the slave traffic, as the petition asserts they are, in many instances,—then I state my opinion, it is of little importance, but, for myself, it is fit I should state it, that this is an act of slave-trading, being a partnership with the slave-trade, and that the person exporting such goods, upon such contract, is guilty of felony, within the meaning of the English abolition laws.

Now, there is another and much more important description of dealing, because much more extensive in its application, to which I entreat the attention of your lordships and of her Majesty's government, that is, the act of holding property in a foreign settlement, which is to be cultivated or worked—cultivated in the case of a plantation, or worked in the case of a mine—by slave labour, and, in consequence of holding such property, being concerned in the purchase or sale of slaves, with a view to cultivate the plantation or to work the mine. Upon this kind of dealing, the question arises, do the abolition acts affect it or not?—Is the ownership of such property, and the management of it by buying and selling slaves, within those acts or not? My lords, this is a matter of very great importance; because it appears, though I do not see how or whence the doubt has arisen,—but I should rather say how the confident opinion is entertained, that this is a dealing in slavery and slaves, to which the abolition law does not apply. That some such opinion is generally prevalent, seems clear, for it has been acted upon by a number of most respectable individuals, and acted upon to a great extent. It has led to their engaging in a variety of important transactions,—it has induced them to invest their capital to a large amount in foreign settlements,—it has encouraged some to purchase and work the slave concerns, others to lend their capital to those who work them. These respectable parties never would have thought of such transactions, had they not been well assured of their legality; and yet, when your lordships come to consider the provisions of the law, and how it bears upon such dealings, I hardly think I have a right to express a doubt that you will be under the necessity of holding them to be illegal. The acting or dealing on which the question arises, is this:—we are not speaking of holding slave property;

that of itself is nothing; for the emancipation act of 1833, did not prohibit British subjects from holding slaves in foreign settlements in the same way that the Abolition Act had prohibited British subjects from slave-trading in foreign settlements; the measures were, in this respect, differently framed, consequently, after the act of 1833, and even after the final period of emancipation, 1840, it was lawful for a British subject to have property in slaves in a foreign settlement. But the question is this:—Has it been lawful since the Abolition Law—meaning, of course, the law abolishing the slave-trade,—has it been lawful for a British subject to purchase slaves, voluntarily to make himself the holder of slaves, to buy slaves or to sell slaves, in a foreign country? The question arises upon the legality of that act, I have been represented as having said—I must have been so represented, because I have received one or two letters probably from persons engaged in these transactions, or whose friends are so engaged, and who are desirous of knowing if it be true, that I had no doubt, that such dealing was lawful, and was not struck at by the abolition law. Now, in presenting the petition, I carefully abstained from saying any such thing—I most carefully abstained from giving any such opinion. I could not have given any such opinion; because if called on to say whether it was lawful or not, my opinion certainly was, that it is illegal. I do not say it is a matter free from all doubt; but, certainly, though my opinion may be worth little, yet, as far as it goes, the abolition law strikes at those dealings; and I will state the grounds of that opinion. As your lordships will remember, a change took place in the abolition law in 1824. The act of 1811 (the 51st Geo. III. c. 23.), which I had the great satisfaction of introducing, and which obtained the unanimous concurrence of the House of Commons and of your lordships, in every stage of the Bill, made slave-trading punishable as a crime; before that time, it had only been dealt with as an offence against the revenue laws—treated as smuggling, and visited with fine and forfeiture. But my Bill made it a felony. Then in 1824, a material alteration was made: slave trading was divided into two kinds, one being declared to be piracy, and liable to capital punishment, if committed within the Admiralty jurisdiction; and the other, if out of that jurisdiction, declared to be a *clergyable* felony, and punished with fourteen years transportation. Now, in attaching the lesser punishment to the act of slave-trading committed out of the Admiralty jurisdiction, the statute 5 Geo. IV. c. 113. gives this description. I shall only read the part applicable to the transactions in question—the buying and selling slaves in foreign countries. The first section having declared all such proceedings to be unlawful, and having generally prohibited them, the tenth declares them to be felony, and punishable, as I have stated, with fourteen years transportation, in these terms:—

“Except in such special cases as are hereinafter provided for, if any person shall deal, trade in, purchase, sell, barter, or transfer, or contract for the dealing, trading in, purchasing, selling, bartering, or transferring of any slave or slaves, or persons intended to be dealt with as slaves, he shall be deemed and taken to be a felon, and, being convicted thereof, shall be adjudged guilty of felony, and suffer fourteen years transportation.”

Then the thirteenth section provides for these special cases, contemplated in the exception of the tenth section, following precisely the words of the enacting part of that section:—

“Provided always, that nothing hereinbefore contained shall be deemed or taken to prevent any person from dealing, trading in, purchasing, selling, bartering, or transferring, or contracting, to deal, trade in, purchase, sell, barter, or transfer any slave or slaves, lawfully being within any island, colony, dominion, fort, or factory, belonging to, or in the possession of, his Majesty, in case such dealing, &c., be with the true intent and meaning of employing such slave or slaves in such colony in which he or they may be at the time of such employment.”

And then comes the fourteenth section, which gives power to remove, by land or by sea, any slaves from one part of any such colony, in the possession of his Majesty to another part of any such colony; but if the other part of the colony happens to be another island, then that person shall only be allowed to transfer a slave from one island to another by licence first had and obtained from the governor of the colony, upon satisfactory proof being made to such governor, that the slave is only intended to be removed from one estate, the property of the owner of the slave, to another estate, also the property of such owner of the slave. Then how can a person in Brazil or Cuba be authorized to buy a slave under the thirteenth section, or to remove a slave by land or by sea from one part to another of Cuba or Brazil under the proviso in the fourteenth section, when neither Cuba nor Brazil are places in the possession or under the dominion of the British crown; the special cases in which, alone, it is provided by the thirteenth or fourteenth sections, that the felony is not committed, namely, the cases of buying, selling, or removing in the colonies' settlements or possessions of the British crown? It is upon these grounds, I feel bound to state my inability to understand on what view of the law those respectable parties have been advised to proceed, who have embarked in these speculations—have become the owners of slaves by purchase, or, which is the same thing, have, by their agents, purchased and sold, or transferred and removed, slaves in Cuba or in Brazil. I am unable to perceive upon what view of the law they can have been advised that they may safely embark in such speculations. So, likewise, it is made felony by the tenth section, knowingly to lend or advance money or goods to be employed in accomplishing any of the objects hereinbefore forbidden or declared to be unlawful,—those objects being the buying, selling, bartering, or in any manner dealing in slaves or persons intended to be dealt with as slaves. How any person can have been advised, with a due regard to the provisions of these Acts, either to send goods or to advance money for the purpose of working a concern which requires the buying and selling of slaves, surpasses my powers of comprehension. Nevertheless, that such advice must have been given,—that such a view of the law must have been taken, there cannot be a doubt; because numbers of wealthy and respectable individuals are known to have embarked their capital in the cultivation of foreign plantations, and the working of foreign mines; to say nothing of the original act of becoming owners of the stock of slaves upon the property by the purchase. What then remains to be done? I trust that my Noble Friends opposite will turn their attention to this subject at the earliest possible period; and if any doubts should, upon a full consideration of the statutes appear to exist, that they will, as soon as Parliament meets, come down with a declaratory Act to have those doubts removed; but if there should be no doubt,—if it should be clear that the Acts in question are illegal,—then the most satisfactory course would be to notify the law by

Proclamation, warning all persons who have unwarily got into the predicament which I have described, that the sooner they remove themselves from that predicament the better and the safer will it be for them. Such a course is only fair towards the parties, more especially towards those who have unwarily purchased shares in joint-stock concerns, most of whom may be supposed ignorant of the dealing in slaves which their capital has been supporting. The proclamation will give them due notice of this, and put them upon withdrawing from the partnership. At all events, it will prevent the possibility of any persons hereafter embarking in the same speculations, by stating what the inevitable consequence must be of such transactions.

My Lords, the course which the legislature formerly took with respect to the slave-trade, appears to me, in connexion with the present question, to be well deserving the attention both of the government and your lordships. In 1806, the first Bill prohibiting the traffic, was brought in by my late learned and excellent friend, Sir Arthur Pigott, then Attorney-General under Lord Grenville's Administration; it passed with little opposition, and is the 46th Geo. III. It prohibited the foreign slave-trade; that is, it forbade any British subject to engage in the slave-trade carried on by foreign countries or colonies; and it forbade the lending of money, or sending goods, or in any way embarking capital in transactions connected with that foreign traffic. In 1807, Lord Grey (then Lord Howick) brought in the first general Abolition Act, the 47th Geo. III., which made all slave-trading within the dominions of the British crown, and all slave-trading by British subjects everywhere, liable to pecuniary penalties, including the forfeiture of the ship and cargo. Then came the 51st Geo. III., the Act which I had the honour of passing through parliament, and which declared slave-trading to be felony, in the way I have already described. And, lastly, the Act of 1824, brought in by Mr. Canning, (the 5th Geo. IV.) made the change in the law which I before stated, repealing or consolidating the former statutes; but that Act, so far from diminishing the stringency of their provisions, extended them considerably, and made some dealings which before were not deemed slave-trading to be clearly slave-trading; and amongst others, made the transactions to which I have called the attention of your lordships punishable as felonies, with the differences to which I have adverted.

It thus appears that the slave-trading of British subjects in foreign colonies was the first branch of the traffic which the law struck down, and that when all slave-trading was not only made illegal, but, in the end, felonious, the foreign branch was, as might be expected, included in the enactment. My lords, nothing but the late period of the session prevents me from taking the course, now, which I took in 1810, with respect to the African slave-trade, when it was found that the acts of 1806 and 1807 were ineffectual; namely, the moving a resolution and address, pledging the house, “at an early period in the next session, to take the subject into its serious consideration, with a view to prevent such daring violations of the law.” That proposition was adopted unanimously by the House of Commons; and, in consequence of the address, the felony Bill was brought in the next year, and passed with equal unanimity. If your lordships see any objection to such an address now from the session being about to close, I should be unwilling to press it on your attention. At any rate, I shall be satisfied with the declaration of the noble earl, the president of the board of trade, that he will lose no time, upon the prorogation of parliament, in drawing the attention of the law-officers of the crown to the subject, and in dealing with it as the result of the inquiry may show to be most effectual for carrying into complete execution the existing laws. Legal proceedings may probably be required in some cases; but the proclamation will also be advisable. With respect to the report of Dr. Madden, on the state of things upon the African coast, I understand my noble friend has some objection to its being laid before parliament. I have no doubt he will state the nature of that objection. As it contains some valuable details, I shall move for its production. But whether it be produced or not, I trust the government will not fail to act immediately upon the information which it conveys.

Before concluding my statement, I wish to call the attention of my noble friend, the president of the board of control, to the state of slavery and the slave-trade, in that part of the world with which his duties are most immediately connected. Much doubt has been expressed as to the legal existence of slavery in Malacca. It certainly was the opinion of one Malacca government that there was no such thing countenanced by law, although another entertained, subsequently, a different opinion; but all doubts should have been removed by the unanimous resolution which was adopted by the whole body of the proprietors, in November, 1829, to liberate all their slaves on the 31st December, 1841. I think this would be perfectly good ground for an order in council, putting down slavery in the colony; and I have no doubt my noble friend will take that subject into his consideration, the rather that I believe he agrees with those who hold it to be unsanctioned by law. I will now draw his attention to the dreadful effects of slavery and slave-trading in that part of the world which is under his administration. By the kindness of one of the individuals engaged in the law commission in India, I have had access to a report made by Lord Auckland, and which I apprehend has been sent to my noble friend.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH.—It has been sent, and was printed and laid on the table of the House of Commons early in April.

LORD BROUGHAM.—I was not aware of that, having been abroad at the time. It contains a report made to the commissioners by Major Sleeman, who describes the practices resorted to by certain gangs of the natives for the purpose of supplying the slave-market, he says:—

“These gangs invariably take their families with them on their expeditions, and the female members of the gangs are employed as inveiglers to win the confidence of the emigrant families they fall in with on the road. They introduce these families to the gang, and they are prevailed upon to accompany them to some place suitable for their designs upon them, when the parents are murdered by the men, while the women take care of the children.”

He then gives the examination of a number of the wretches who belong to those gangs. One of them says,—“We call our trade *megpunna*, our trade being,” he adds, “the murder of travellers for their children.” Another of them, being examined, says, in answer to the question:—

“Are you not afraid that the children will disclose the manner in which you got them, and thereby get you into trouble?—We invariably murder our victims at night, first taking the precaution to put the children to sleep,

and in the morning we tell them that we have purchased them of their parents, who have gone off and left them."

Again he is asked:—

"You seem to have been in the habit of selling children in all parts of the country, how have you avoided being apprehended?—The children are seldom aware of the fate of their parents; and, in general, we sell them to people very well acquainted with the nature of our proceedings."

But it is not merely a general description which they give. The details, of their commerce are presented to us. Another Jemadar, or leader of one of these gangs, says:—

"After the capture of Bhurtpoor," (which, according to my recollection, was in the year 1816,) "Nancoo Sing, Brinjarah, and four other Brinjarahs, residents of Kurnoul, came to me with four travellers and their four children, and invited me to participate in their murder, which I consented to, and with the assistance of my gang we strangled the whole of them, preserving the lives of the children, whom we sold at Jelpore for 120 rupees."—(that is about £12.) "half of which was divided among the members of my gang. After this affair, I resolved on selecting for my victims the poorest class of travellers,"—(which they do manifestly because poor people are less likely to be inquired after), "and murdering them for their children, for whom there was so great a demand in all the great cities. Since which I have committed the following murders:—"

And then, I presume, he related the number of murders, though the report omits them.

Another of these jemadars, when examined, is desired to give the particulars of the Husseengunge affair, and he says,—

"I left my home with a gang of forty Thugs, and proceeded to Husseengunge, where Heera Dass and Rookmunee went to the city of Muttra for the purpose of buying some clothes, and succeeded in winning the confidence of four travellers, two men and two women, with their three children, whom they brought with them to our encampment; after passing two days with us, Teella Dass, Mudhoo Dass, Brinjarahs, and Dewa Hookma, Teelake, Gungarum, Brinjarahs, Balluck Dass, Chutter Dass, Neput Dass, and Hunooman Dass, prevailed on this family to accompany them to the banks of the Jumma, and murdered the four elderly travellers in a garden near the village of Gokool; after throwing their bodies into the Jumma, they took their three children to the tando, or encampment, of Dewa Brinjarah, near the village of Kheir, and sold the two female children for forty rupees, and the male for five rupees."

The murder, therefore, of these four persons was committed for between £4 and £5. Another person, a woman, who was examined, said,—

"We now went off to Thunseir, where we encamped in a grove on the bank of a tank, and here several parties of travellers were inveigled by the wives of the leaders of our gangs to come and take up their lodgings with us:—1. A Chumar, with three daughters, one thirty years of age, and the others young. 2. The widow of a carpenter, and her son, ten years of age. 3. A Brahmin and his wife, with one beautiful daughter, fourteen years old, another five, and a son six years of age. 4. A Brahmin and his wife, with one daughter about fourteen, another twelve, and a son three years of age. These travellers lodged for two or three days among the tents of the Naeks and Brinjarahs; after which we all went one morning to a village in the territory of the Toorooee Rajah; I forget his name. Here very heavy rain fell at night, and deluged the country, and we got no rest. The next morning we went to a village on the bank of the canal, still in the same Rajah's country. The next day we went to a village on the bank of the Jumma; and two hours after night Kaner Dass proposed that we should go down to the sacred stream of the Jumma, say our prayers, and remain there. They all went down accordingly, leaving me, Roopla and his second wife (Rookmunee) at the village. They murdered the seven men and women, and threw their bodies into the river; but who killed them, or how they were killed, I know not. The Chumar and his eldest daughter, the two Brahmins and their wives, and the carpenter's widow, were all murdered. They brought the nine children back to us a watch and a half before daylight. They were all crying a good deal after their parents, and we quieted them the best way we could with sweetmeats and playthings. We came to Beebeepore, and encamped in the grove. A daughter and son of the Brahmin's were extremely beautiful, and these we left with Dhyam Sing for sale. We came on to a village, a coss distant from Beebeepore. Here a trooper came up to Beebeepore, saying that he had heard of several people being murdered, and suspected us of the crime. The head men of the village of Beebeepore, and some of the Brinjarahs came to our camp with the trooper, and assured him that he must be mistaken, as they knew us all to be very honest, inoffensive people; and, taking him back to Beebeepore, they treated him with great consideration, and he went away apparently satisfied. But, fearing that our deeds had become known, Pemla and Newla's wives and Pemla's mother took off the seven other children to Dhyam Sing, and left them all in his charge. Pemla went to Kurnaul, and Goor-buksh and his gang went to Beebeepore, while my husband and his party remained where we were. A woman who keeps prostitutes came from Kurnaul, and purchased and took away all the children."

Human language sinks under the vain attempt at giving utterance to the mingled feelings of pity and of horror which rise in the breast upon the recital of such atrocities as these,—a vain attempt, and as superfluous as vain,—for I defy any power of the imagination to paint a scene more hideous, more unbearable than the simple description of the deeds themselves, in the plain words of the monsters who perpetrated them. Africa itself, steeped in blood for centuries by other branches of the infernal slave traffic, and still laid waste by the Spaniards and Portuguese,—with the connivance, I am grieved to say, of more humane nations,—Africa itself never presented a more appalling sight,—a more horrible example of that utter disregard for human life,—that proneness to take it away,—with which the traffic in human beings appears to strike and blight the heart in every region which it is permitted to curse.

My lords, while giving way to our natural feelings respecting these wretches, we ought to reserve a part of our indignation for the system in which their execrable enormities have their origin. They are the naturally appointed fruits of slave trading; but you may be well assured that, as long

as it is lawful to hold human beings in slavery, the dealing in slaves cannot be put down; and atrocities like these which I have deemed it my painful duty to detail, will, in one shape or another, never cease to be committed.

My lords, I have no doubt whatever, that the advice will now be adopted which was given by my noble friend, formerly the secretary for the colonies (Lord Glenelg), a few months before he left that department, when—well acquainted as he is with all Indian affairs, and anxious for the general emancipation of the slaves,—he strongly recommended the acceleration of that great event in Ceylon. Considering the great weight of his authority on this subject, I have no doubt that his very important despatch of the 24th of November, 1838, will be taken into early and attentive consideration by my noble friend at the head of the Indian department. It applies, in principle, to India, as well as Ceylon, and it will, I trust, lead to measures, accelerating, as much as possible, a general emancipation,—the most effectual means of extinguishing the slave-trade, and preventing such atrocities as we have just been forced to contemplate.

HOLLAND.

We have much pleasure in inserting the following extracts from a letter, dated Amsterdam, November 10th, 1841, and addressed to Mr. G. W. Alexander.

"My dear Friend,—Thou hast judged very rightly in stating that I and many others were not aware, several years ago, of the frightful evils which attend slavery. I can truly say, that the more I consider it the more I become desirous of seeing an end of it, but I fear the moment is as yet far when this wished for event will take place in the West India colonies of this country. Several planters, indeed, are fully convinced of the propriety of the measure, and heartily wish it might be soon accomplished, but many others are opposed to it; and our government dares not take any decisive step, not having the means to propose an indemnity to the planters. There is besides a circumstance which throws an obstacle in the way of this measure, but which ought on the contrary to forward it; this is the existence of the free negroes in the upper part of the colony of Surinam. It is generally feared, that, if the slaves were set at liberty, a great number of them would repair to the woods to join their free brothers, who for the most part are still attached to their heathen and superstitious worship, and on that account, instead of increasing in numbers, are rapidly decreasing, as their women are kept by them in a worse state of slavery and abjection, than is the case among the slaves themselves. It is to be hoped, however, that their situation will ere long be altered for the better, as the Moravian brothers have now established a station among them, and wherever they obtain a certain preponderance the manners of the people are soon improved, and the marriages increase, by which means the population increases in proportion, and the women are treated with greater care, and—less exposed to hard work—can nurse their children better. The bad state of the finances of the colony, and the commercial monopoly exercised by some of the leading merchants there, and tolerated, it would seem, to a certain extent by the colonial department at home, are other obstacles thrown in the way of improvements in that colony. Curaçao is in a better state, and the consequence is that the population is increasing in that island, and the slaves feel so happy that they are not desirous of any change. I have no account of the other small islands belonging to this country, but I do not think that they are in a better situation than Surinam, or the Danish island of St. Croix.

"Thou hast no doubt been informed that our friends, Joseph John Gurney and his sister Elizabeth Fry, have visited this country and Denmark, and have everywhere pleaded the cause of emancipation with their wonted eloquence. They had some meetings entirely devoted to that purpose at Rotterdam, the Hague, and this city, which were largely attended, and the result of which, though it cannot be positively asserted, may be supposed to have greatly forwarded a disposition in some of the parties concerned to look towards emancipation with a less fearful eye. The facts advanced by J. J. Gurney were certainly very conclusive, as they showed the real advantages of free-labour, and the moral improvement obtained in consequence of emancipation. The religious point of view was eminently treated by him, but still more so by his sister, who very properly pointed out the reasons which ought to engage truly religious people to come forward in this cause, as the poor negro slaves are not in a situation to plead their cause themselves; and it appears to be the duty of every well disposed christian, to endeavour as much as possible to direct the attention of others to the sufferings of all those who are deprived of the opportunity of themselves exposing their sufferings, and soliciting the redress of the wrongs by which they are oppressed. They had, while at the Hague, an audience of the King and Queen of the Netherlands, and were allowed to lay before them their sentiments on the subject of slavery, as well as on some subjects connected with the prisons of this country. They were attentively listened to, and the King promised to consider seriously their wishes and remarks, and, at his demand, a memorial has been sent to him, through the medium of the British ambassador. They had likewise some interviews with the director of the department of colonies, (Elias, the minister being absent,) and likewise with the ministers both of finance and the interior, who both expressed a concurrence in their views. I have been informed that, at Copenhagen, they have been very kindly received by the King and Queen, and that J. J. Gurney had a very long and interesting interview with the first, and made a deep impression on his mind with regard to the subject of emancipation. I hope this will not remain fruitless.

"We have here a publication recommending the emancipation of slaves in our colonies, which is the work of a young advocate, Jacob de Neufville Az, the same who wrote the dissertation of which I sent thee a copy, entitled *Dissertio hist. polit. inaug. de iis quæ ad tollendum sevorum Afrorum commercium, &c.* The title of his new work may be translated as follows:—*The emancipation of the slaves examined in its consequences, and applied to the colonies of the Netherlands.* The epigraph he has placed before his book is pretty severe, and taken from Isaiah xiii. 11, 12. 'And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity; and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir.' The work is divided into two parts, the first of which contains five chapters, shewing the results of emancipation in the English colonies. The second part has only two chapters, the first of which is devoted to prove how desirable emancipation is in the Dutch colonies, the second contains a plan for realising the same. The first part is grounded on the parliamentary reports, and J. J. Gurney's *Winter in the West Indies*. In the second part he again takes the English colonies as a model to follow, and tries to prove that a smaller quantity of persons will be necessary when liberated than before to do the same quantity of work, and that, the religious and moral condition of the negro population being thereby improved, the population will soon be increased, and this will enable to extend the plantations, &c. In the second chapter he examines all the plans which have been proposed to effect emancipation, and endeavours to point out the obstacles to the accomplishment of these measures and ends with proposing a measure which, in his opinion, is the only one that can be adopted; this is, to bring all the grounds and slaves into the hands of other proprietors, and to place all these properties in the hands of a single proprietor. This appears at first sight almost impossible and, his plan might be considered as inexecutable; but he explains it afterwards in such a manner as gives reason to suppose that, if well conceived and matured, it might take place in case the government approved of it. The society would of course include all the actual proprietors of plantations who are disposed to emancipate their slaves, and who would agree to have their properties in the colony taxed and valued as the rest, but who in consequence of this consent would keep their property at their disposal, provided they gave liberty to their slaves: the proprietors who would refuse to do this would be dispossessed by law, and their plantations would become the property of the society, which would take possession of their lands, and dispose of them in behalf of such capitalists as would agree to the terms on which the society should be founded, namely, the complete emancipation of the negroes. I am afraid it will take some time before the great proprietors agree to this proposal, and yet it is urgent for them to take some decisive measures if they will not lose all; for, should the colony go on as it has for ten or twenty years back, it will in ten or twenty years be fully ruined. The population will dwindle away, and the whole colony will return to a state of nature. The author proposes likewise to send European labourers, but many people think that this measure will never answer, the climate being such that European labourers cannot bear it, and it is certain that the white population there, though nowise obliged to hard manual labour, decreases rapidly, even more so than the blacks: but I am rather inclined to attribute this to the vicious behaviour of many of the whites, and particularly to the use as well as abuse of strong liquors and generous wines. And to this may be added another cause, namely, that the doctors or physicians of the colony are few in number, and many of them possess but little skill. They do not study sufficiently the effect of climate and the means of preserving health. I intend sending thee two or three copies of the above-mentioned work per first opportunity. It has been violently attacked in a new publication called *De Tydgenoot* (the Contemporary), but has not yet passed through the paws of our reviewers."

SLAVE TRADE ON THE BARBARY COAST.

[From the Parliamentary Papers.]

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON TO LORD PONSOMBY.

Foreign Office, October 8, 1840.

MY LORD,—I herewith transmit to your Excellency the accompanying copies of papers, relative to the exportation of black slaves from the port of Tripoli to the Levant in Turkish vessels; and I have to instruct you to communicate these papers to the Turkish government, and to endeavour to persuade the Porte to discourage the trade in question. I have, &c.

(Signed)

PALMERSTON.

COLONEL WARRINGTON TO SIR H. GREY.

Tripoli, July 22, 1840.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that his Highness the Pacha sent 500 horsemen to meet a rich and numerous caravan from Ghadames and Timbuctoo, and escort it down to Tripoli.

Sheiks Abgelled and Ghoma despatched a body of cavalry, took the caravan, and destroyed the escort sent by the pacha.

The commander of it, Bush Aga Bezan, was strangled last Saturday at the camp of Pacha, and four sheikhs of the Sharfana tribe disgraced, by being placed on borricos with their faces blackened, and paraded through the camp. By this plunder great wealth falls to Abgelled and Ghoma, and numerous black slaves.

On Saturday last another caravan was captured coming from the East.

The Turks have the greatest facility in transporting black slaves to the Levant, in their vessels returning without cargo, which tends to increase that trade.

The export of black slaves from the port of Tripoli may be computed at

3000 annually. The demand for them has increased considerably, inasmuch as they now sell from 50 to 100 dollars each, and the women from 100 to 110 dollars, whereas in the time of Yousuf Bashaw the average price was from 30 to 40 dollars. Abgelled takes one out of four, or 25 per cent., in passing the territory he holds; but I know he is averse to that trade, and it is to his credit, that during the last eight years he has never sent a marauding army to capture them. I have, &c.

(Signed)

H. WARRINGTON.

COLONEL WARRINGTON TO MR. BIDWELL.

Tripoli, August 10, 1840.

SIR,—In the *Morning Herald* I see what passed at a public meeting for the suppression of African slavery, in which his Royal Highness Prince Albert, expressed deep interest on that important question.

After twenty-seven years' residence here, and having had these suffering people daily under my observation, and having always taken a lively interest in their fate, I trust my offering an opinion will not be considered presumption. The cause of this revolting traffic in the flesh and blood of our fellow-creatures arises generally from the want of labour and occupation. The unbounded natural wealth, the spontaneous productions, and the fertility of the soil, plainly show that labour is the only thing wanting (and commercial outlet for the produce of that labour) to direct the mind in more profitable and honourable pursuits. I wish particularly to state the necessity of promoting industry and labour, otherwise the slaves taken in battle, and now preserved for the sake of gain, would be destroyed.

A free and direct intercourse with the inhabitants of the interior is the first step I should recommend in the promotion of civilization and commerce. Resident agents at various places in the interior would be desirable, at least where we know they would be safe.

The profits on trade will be great, and the advantages the natives would derive, will tend much for the safety of individuals and the accomplishment of the grand and ultimate object, the emancipation of the poor and suffering slave. To obtain a footing in the interior it is evident Tripoli affords advantages not to be found in any part of the extensive coast of Africa. Excepting by name (which is certainly revered and respected), England cannot dictate or use force in the interior; but an opening is to be made, and protection given, on the coast.

The natives of the interior are great fanatics, and their bad feeling to Christians has arisen from the want of intercourse and knowledge of our humane and honourable intentions. In the first stage I should think it would be impolitic to send missionaries to convert, which can only be effected by the gradual advance of intellect, and the proof that our condition is superior to their own. The distribution of simple moral interesting tracts would be well received, and would lead to more desirable ends. Medical men in the interior would be of infinite service; and even a professional man on the coast to send medicines in doses for the use of the natives, would give us great popularity, and prove our benevolent intentions. The civilization and emancipation of the poor and suffering slave has created deep interest and reflection in my mind, and, during the time of Yousuf Bashaw, hundreds have been restored to freedom by me; and I hail with prayers the present period when, apparently, the grand structure will be built on the foundation already laid.

The abolition of black slavery is to be effected, I am certain, in the interior, and not on the high seas only, as the nearer we can approach the disease the more effectual will be the cure.

If I can in the remotest way contribute to the glorious cause, it will give me infinite pleasure, as I have no wish except to do good to my fellow-creatures. The plan I have already suggested of establishing a vice-consul at Fezzan, will, I am sure, pave the way to greater events.

The slaves who have been fortunate enough to obtain their freedom here, have always evinced anxiety to return to their own country; nay, they congregate together and build their huts in the conical plan of the interior, and await favourable circumstances to return.

I have, &c.

(Signed)

H. WARRINGTON.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON TO COLONEL WARRINGTON.

Foreign Office, October 22, 1840.

SIR,—I have received your despatch of the 1st August, 1840, respecting the traffic in slaves from the port of Tripoli, and I have to desire that you will take such steps as you think will be most likely to induce the Moorish chiefs themselves to give up, and to prevent other persons from continuing, the practice of procuring slaves for exportation from Tripoli to the Levant. I have, &c.

PALMERSTON.

SIR THOMAS READE TO MR. BACKHOUSE.

Tunis, June 9th, 1840.

SIR,—I have hitherto delayed acknowledging the receipt of your despatch dated November 22, 1839, under a full impression that I should have been enabled to have obtained, as I had been promised, copies of the contract betwixt the several Moors and Captain Loffredo, of the Tuscan vessel named the *Giovane Africano*, for the conveyance of slaves from this place to Constantinople.

I have no doubt now that these Moors have been persuaded not to grant me these documents, but notwithstanding this, however, the most influential one amongst them, named Sidy Mohammed Benayad, has unequivocally acknowledged to me, in the presence of M. Santellana, the chancellor (clerk), that he had been, together with other Moors, in the constant habit of forwarding slaves for sale to Constantinople by the above-named vessel, and that a portion of the 134 mentioned in my former despatch were his, and were sold at Constantinople.

In the letter from the Prince Corsini addressed to Mr. Fox, copy of which you transmitted to me, he states "that no embarkation of slaves had taken place at Tunis in Tuscan vessels, neither for Constantinople or other destinations;" and he likewise states, "that the Mussulmans, white or black, directed for Constantinople, did, it is true, profit by that occasion of Captain Loffredo, but those passengers were not slaves, each being furnished with a *tiskere* delivered by the local authority." From what I have above stated, you will perceive that Mohammed Benayad asserts the blacks which were embarked in the *Giovane Africano* were absolutely slaves, and sold at Constantinople.

I have examined M. Gaspary, the agent at the Goletta, who is particularly charged with despatching vessels from this port; and he had no hesitation in stating to me, that he was not ignorant that the blacks on

board Captain Loffredo's vessel were slaves, and that he had authority for permitting the vessel to sail, for he never could for a moment have taken upon himself the responsibility of placing these slaves upon the ship's papers without being authorized so to do. Besides which, it is notorious here that slaves have been sent, as mentioned in my former despatch, by vessels despatched from the Tuscan consulate.

It is true that these slaves are embarked with a Tiskere from the Bey, because no Mussulman, of whatever description, is permitted to be embarked without a Tiskere; but these Tiskeres do not mention whether they are slaves or free, but merely describe them as passengers; and if slaves can be so easily embarked by such means, of course the laws for the prohibition of conveying them can at any time be evaded.

The Bey grants these Tiskeres whenever applied for; but surely it cannot be maintained that such Tiskeres can in any manner whatever authorize European vessels, as in the case of Captain Loffredo, taking on board, contrary to law, such a number of blacks for conveyance to other ports, in consequence of their being described *solely as passengers*, without taking any trouble whatever to ascertain the real object for which they were embarked.

M. Gaspary has repeated to me that the whole of the blacks mentioned in the return which I had the honour of transmitting to you were slaves, and I am perfectly convinced that he would never have placed them upon the ship's papers, and have permitted them to leave this, without being authorized [so to do] by the consul to whose nations the ship belongs, which he states most positively to be the case.

M. Gaspary, by a letter which I have received from him in answer to one I wrote, demanding to know if he was aware of any other slaves being embarked upon other vessels than those mentioned in the list which he had delivered to me, or whether any other passenger embarked on board the *Giovane Africano*, July the 14th, 1835, states, "that he placed these negroes in the ship's papers because he knew of no prohibition to the contrary." He, however, adds, "that ten months ago he was formally prohibited from placing any black whatever upon the ship's papers." This order I have no doubt was given to him in consequence of the communication made by Mr. Fox to the Tuscan government.

I enclose a copy of M. Gaspary's letter; and you will perceive by it that he states that no other passenger embarked on board the *Giovane Africano*, the 14th July, 1835, but the conductors of the negroes. This expression alone, in my humble opinion, proves that the unfortunate negroes were slaves. But, however, M. Gaspary, as well as Mohammed Benayad, as I before stated, have confessed to me in the fullest manner that they were slaves.

I have also received another letter from M. Gaspary, a copy of which I beg leave to enclose, in which you will perceive that, since he received the orders not to place any blacks upon ship's papers leaving this, a Turkish brig, named the *Kangali*, Captain Mohammed Enepogli, left this for Constantinople, despatched by the Tuscan consulate, and conveyed away thirty slaves, which, however, he states were not placed in the ship's papers.

I should imagine that, if the Tuscan consul had authority for granting papers to this vessel, he surely could have withheld those papers if the captain persisted in taking slaves on board; for, as I have before mentioned, if slaves can be embarked so easily, the law can be at any time evaded. In the same letter you will likewise find that a Russian brig, named the *Blahaslamen*, Captain Hagelstein, left this for Constantinople the 29th of May, 1836, with thirty slaves on board, despatched by the same consulate; and I am sorry to say, that you will likewise find in the same letter, that a Sardinian brig, named the *Madonna del Boschetto*, Captain Antonio Ognio, sailed from this on the 21st of June, 1837, having on board thirty-two. I was not before aware of these two last circumstances.

I have called M. Gaspary before me, and read to him this despatch in the presence of Mr. Moses Santillana, in order to avoid any mistake, and he confirmed to me the information which is contained in it. I have, &c.

(Signed)

J. Backhouse, Esq., &c. &c. &c.

T. READE.

(Translation.)

In reply to the letter with which you honoured me under yesterday's date, I hasten to inform you that, to my knowledge, no other negroes have been embarked here for the Levant than those of which I made mention in the statements I have transmitted to you, which negroes were entered by me on the bill of health of the vessels as Mussulmans, as expressed in the Tiskere of the Bey, and not as negro slaves; and I have also acted thus as there was not any prohibition against it; and to my knowledge no other flags have embarked negroes but the Russian, Tuscan, and Ottoman, and two Greek vessels with Russian protections. But for some months before this, about ten months, I have been formally forbidden, in fact, to enter on a ship's list any negro; and indeed an Ottoman vessel which sailed in January for Constantinople, having about thirty negroes, took them on board without their being entered on the bill of health.

On board the *Giovane Africano* there were no passengers but the conductors of the blacks; as far as I can recollect they were of Tripoli.

The Russian vessels are despatched from Tunis by the same Dutch consulate as Turkish vessels; but of these latter some have been actually despatched by the Sardinian or Imperial Consulate; but this last named practice has existed but a short time. I have, &c.

(Signed)

(Translation.)

GASPARY.

In reply to your prized letter of this day's date, I hasten to inform you that the Turkish vessel *Kangali*, Captain Mohammed Enepogli, which sailed hence on the 24th January for Constantinople was despatched by the consulate of Tuscany, but the thirty negroes which she embarked, were not entered on the vessel's papers in any way.

Having afterwards examined my register of arrivals and departures, I find that the Australian brig *Zodiaco*, Captain P. G. Calvi, which sailed hence for Smyrna and Constantinople, on the 5th July, 1836, did not embark any negroes; that the Russian brig *Blahaslamen*, Captain Hagelstein, which sailed for Constantinople the 29th May, 1836, embarked forty-two passengers, among whom were thirty negroes; and that the Sardinian brig *Madonna del Boschetto*, Captain Antonio Ognio, which sailed 21st June, 1837, for Constantinople, had thirty-five passengers, among whom were thirty-two negroes. I have, &c.

(Signed)

GASPARY.

SIR THOMAS READE TO VISCOUNT PALMERSTON.

Tunis, October 15, 1840.

MY LORD.—It has just come to my knowledge that an Ottoman polacca ship, whereof Aly Ombayaglu is master, left this for Constantinople this morning, having on board fifty-four negro slaves. I am informed that this vessel was furnished with consular papers from the Dutch consulate (the Dutch consul acting here as consular agent for the Ottoman Porte); but that the negroes were not mentioned in any manner upon the papers, nor is my informant aware of the circumstance of their embarkation being known to the Dutch consul.

It appears to me, however, to say the least of it, extraordinary that such a quantity of slaves could have been thus put on board a vessel without any knowledge of the consul who furnished the ship with her papers, or any person belonging to his consulate; and, if greater precautions than such as have been manifested upon this occasion are not taken, it will be difficult to place that check upon this abominable traffic, which I am of opinion might with facility be effected, provided the consul who despatches the vessels intended for the conveyance of slaves should feel disposed to do so.

(Signed)

THOMAS READE.

SLAVERY IN BRITISH INDIA: LORD AUCKLAND'S MINUTE

In the year 1833, the Act for the renewal of the East India charter was passed. That Act required, among other important things, that the Governor-general in Council, should "forthwith take into consideration the means of mitigating the state of slavery, and of ameliorating the condition of slaves, and of extinguishing slavery throughout the said territories, so soon as such extinction shall be practicable and safe." Instead, however, of this having been done, year after year has been allowed to pass away without producing any the least amelioration in the condition of the slave population, or making a single advance towards the consummation of the great object the British legislature had in view. Had the people of England remained silent, the subject would have still remained in abeyance. As soon, however, as it became evident to the home government that the abolitionists were earnestly directing their attention to the matter, they forwarded instructions to the governor-general to use greater diligence in complying with the requisitions of Parliament, and to report in what position the question stood. This was felt to be very inconvenient to the law commissioners to whom it had been referred, and they entered upon the duties which had been devolved on them with reluctance. They say, in a communication to Lord Auckland, probably written in the early part of this year, "it was not without regret that we were compelled to withdraw our attention from several subjects on which we were engaged, and which, in our opinion, are of still greater importance than slavery." An affair upon which these gentlemen entered with such evident reluctance, and which they considered as comparatively unimportant, though it actually involved the personal liberty, the civil rights, and the happiness of millions of British subjects, was not likely to engage that measure of attention, and that promptitude in applying an effectual remedy, which the monstrous evils it involved, so peremptorily required. It was felt to be a burden rather than a duty, nevertheless after two years' labour, they produced a report, founded in great measure on documents which had been already laid before Parliament, and in view of the instructions they had received from the East India directors, through the governor-general of India. That report was transmitted to England, on the 8th of February, 1841, and has been printed by order of parliament, and to it the attention of our readers has already been called.

After the lapse of eight years from the passing of the East India Charter bill, the governor-general has transmitted to the home government a minute on "Slavery in India," founded on the report of the commissioners, which we now propose to review. It bears date the 6th May, 1841, and is the first of a series of minutes on the same subject, with which we are to be favoured, by the members forming the council of that high functionary. In the despatch from that body, dated 10th May, 1841, which accompanied the governor's minute, addressed to the court of directors of the East India Company, they say, "Your honorable court will be pleased to consider the subject as still under discussion by the government, and the sentiments of the remaining members of the council will be communicated with the least possible delay." It thus appears that we must wait yet longer before we can form any opinion as to the measures that may be recommended for the ultimate adoption of the government, for the removal of the palpable evils so long and so justly the subject of complaint.

The observations of the law commissioners, contained in Parliamentary papers No. 262, 1841, pp. 188 to 222, both inclusive, and the minute of the governor-general of India, which will be found in No. 54, 1841, pp. 2 to 5, are chiefly valuable as shewing the opinions entertained by these functionaries of the system of slavery in British India, and the measures they recommend for adoption to mitigate its severities and correct its abuses.

The commissioners are not agreed as to the regulations that should be enforced for "ameliorating the condition of slaves." Messrs. Cameron and Millett advise "that any act which would be an assault if done to a freeman, shall be an assault, and punishable as such if done to a slave by his master, or by any other person." Messrs. Amos, Elliott, and Borradaile, after a laboured statement that the law of Indian slavery allows the master the power of coercion, "for the purpose of enforcing their (the slaves') services, maintaining discipline among them, and preventing their absconding"—that the slave "submits without complaint to moderate correction inflicted by his master for the breach or neglect of his regular duties," considering that the evil "of thus being com-

pelled to work, is compensated by the advantage of maintenance for himself and family"—that "slaves employed in field labour, at least, would not work with the like industry as hired labourers" without the power of moderate correction being lodged somewhere—"that they will indulge in that propensity to idleness so characteristic of the lower classes in India," and will do nothing they can avoid doing," without correction, that, as every master, at least, of prædial slaves, "may be expected to have a natural desire of improving his income, and thereby increasing his comforts, and in proportion as that desire is more or less strong, so will be the motive to urge his slaves to exertion," which he could not do without the power of coercion: therefore "the majority of the commissioners consider, that as "a law taking away all power of correcting and restraining slaves, would have the effect, as far as the promulgation of a law could do it, of abolishing slavery," they think it would neither be just nor prudent, to take it away, without providing compensation, or without transferring the power to the magistrate, neither of which courses appears to them desirable," and, therefore, they would continue "the restricted power of coercion and restraint, which the masters may now lawfully exercise." In one point all the commissioners agree, namely, to let slavery itself alone, and to direct their attention exclusively to the correction of its abuses. In their separate report, Messrs. Cameron and Millett observe, "As the object is to let slavery perish quietly, legislation should, it seems to us, be confined to the mere prevention of its evils;" and their colleagues, Messrs. Amos, Elliott and Borradaile, concur in the conclusion, that it "would be more beneficial for the slaves themselves, as well as a wiser and safer course, to direct immediate attention to the removal of the abuses of slavery, rather than to recommend its sudden and abrupt abolition." These gentlemen may be excellent lawyers, but they are poor philosophers. They would prevent the evils which necessarily spring from slavery, itself the greatest of all evils—they would remove the abuses of slavery, itself the greatest of all abuses—by letting it alone, as though the effect could be destroyed while the cause was in operation. We have had experiments enough in the West Indies to prove the folly of attempting to "mitigate the state of slavery," and the wisdom of securing its entire abolition.

But ample as are the materials for discussion afforded by the separate reports of the commissioners, we must direct our attention, at the present time, more particularly to the minute of the Governor-general, and only refer to them as occasion may require.

In perusing this important document, the first thing that struck us was its obscurity, and the almost total want of interest manifested by Lord Auckland in the great subject to which it refers. Perhaps the first may have arisen from transcription, or may be traced to the printer; and the second may be attributed to the absorption of his lordship's mind in the Afghan war and its consequences, or the still later contests with the Chinese, and what remains to be done with them. But whether this obscurity and indifference are to be traced to these causes or not, we are quite sure that the people of England are quite alive to the subject, both as a question of humanity and of national honour, and will admit of no other delay in its settlement than may be necessary to pass the law for that purpose.

In the opening remark of the governor-general, he observes, that the subject of slavery in India "is undoubtedly a most difficult and extensive one," and yet his lordship disposes of it in a very summary manner, and arrives at a general conclusion, which he expresses in the following terms: "In a word, I would legislate as little as possible now, and that only so as directly to advance the great end of practical freedom, whilst I would look forward with anxiety to a period when the government may be enabled to fulfil the design of the British legislature by a declaration of the entire extinction of slavery as a state in any manner recognised by our laws." How far his lordship would legislate may be seen from the following extracts from the minute: "I am prepared to pass a law declaring that any act which would be an offence if done to a freeman, shall be equally an offence if done to a slave, or as I would rather say, to any one in any condition of dependence on a master, and I would add to such an act, that "no right claimed as arising out of an alleged state of slavery, shall be enforced by a magistrate," concurring in the last particular with two of the commissioners, Messrs. Cameron and Millett, and going beyond them in the former, those gentlemen expressly limiting their recommendation to assaults on slaves, whereas the Governor-general extends his to "any act which would be an offence done to a freeman." This, strictly interpreted, would amount to the abolition of slavery in India, which we fear is more than his lordship intends by it. The sale of a freeman is illegal—this would make the sale of a slave illegal also—compulsory labour, as it relates to freemen, is illegal—this would make it illegal in reference to slaves also. In the one case the master could not deal with them as property, in the other he must, to secure their services, pay them an equivalent for the same, and treat them in all respects as freemen. He could not compel their residence on his estate, nor exact from them any but voluntary labour. His lordship goes on to say "such an enactment would be entirely in accordance with the dictum of the Mohammedan lawyers as applied to the actual state of those classed as slaves in India." This is an important admission, for it settles at once the question so far as the Mohammedan part of our Indian subjects are concerned, and is in harmony with the best authorities upon the subject. According to the most eminent law doctors, "All men are by nature free and independent and no man can be the subject of property, except an infidel, in-

habiting a country not under the power and control of the faithful. 'His right of possession, which mooslims possess over heurbees (that is infidels fighting against the faith) is acquired by isteela, which means the entire subduement of any subject of property by force of arms. The original right of property, therefore, which one man may possess over another, is acquired solely by isteela, (as defined above) and cannot be obtained in the first instance by purchase, donation, or heritage. As far back as the year 1808, Judge Richardson proposed, "that the state of slavery throughout the British possessions should be determined by Mohammedan law." Had this been done not a slave would now be found in British India. At the present moment there are a large body of slaves held by Mohammedans illegally, these of course must be declared free. The judges of the Foujdary Adawlut, in a letter addressed by them to the government, 22nd March, 1841, say the decision of the Mohammedan law officer, referred to by Lord Auckland in his minute, "applies to males as well as females, and to the prædial slaves in Malabar, Tanjore, and elsewhere." This point must be borne in mind. It places a weapon in our hands, which if skilfully wielded, must inevitably terminate slavery in British India, as it will be utterly impossible to preserve the institution of slavery among the Hindoos, when once it is abolished among the Mohammedans in British India.

The effect of the proposed law is thus stated by his lordship: "In prohibiting every kind of coercion by the master over the person, and all summary interference of authority, for the return of a person claimed as a slave to his assuming owner, we shall in truth do away with all such practices, for no one will be found to purchase that, of the continued possession of which he can have no assurance." But why should his lordship shrink from declaring slavery to be illegal, openly and publicly? He admits it to be so among Mohammedans. The Mohammedans admit it themselves. Then why not act upon the admission immediately, and follow up that act by a law, if it be necessary, which shall terminate the same system among the Hindoos, immediately and entirely? This, Lord Auckland may be assured, is the only way to prevent the sale of children for prostitution—to put down the horrible system of kidnapping and megpunnaim, to destroy the slave-trade; and deliver the slaves from their oppressions. While slavery is suffered to remain in any form, whilst its name is suffered to exist, whilst its taint is allowed to remain upon any one of the millions of India, the work of emancipation will not be complete.

That Lord Auckland does not contemplate the entire abolition of slavery in British India is clear from the following paragraphs, viz. "I would, however, be disposed by a separate law, (guarding the national custom of adoption,) wholly to prohibit the sales of children, excepting possibly, after the example of the Bombay regulation of 1827,) in seasons of distress, such as follow upon inundation or famine, and under checks which might be then imposed by the executive government." Again, "It might perhaps be as well, as a part of our measures for the amelioration of the condition of servitude in India, to obtain periodical reports of the state of slaves or bondsmen, and of legal transactions affecting them, in the districts in which such classes are most numerous." Thus it will be seen that his lordship would provide for the sale of children during inundations and famines, notwithstanding the "frightful abuses," which he admits, "grow out of such sales;" and would confine the attention of government to "periodical reports of the state of slaves or bondmen, and of the legal transactions affecting them." And is this all his lordship contemplates in his proposed enactments? We should be sorry to do his lordship injustice, by misrepresenting his proposed measures, but we feel utterly at a loss how to harmonise the different parts of his minute with each other. At one time, he appears to lay down a principle which, if honestly applied, would overthrow slavery, and at another time, he sanctions the existence of slavery, and merely proposes measures to check its abuses. His lordship would "legislate as little as possible" on this great subject, and so would we—the difference, however, between us is great, what he would regulate, we would destroy.

We extract the following observations on the same document from the *Morning Herald*.

We have laboured long and zealously in denouncing the hideous condition of slavery, wherever it is permitted to exist, as among the most enormous offences against his Maker, and the most insolent treason against his own race, which it is possible for civilised man to sanction. In this feeling we have watched for some years past, with increasing jealousy and suspicion, the aspect of domestic society (so to call a social condition to the miseries and defects of which we are happily strangers in Europe) in British and in tributary India. The Indian government at home and abroad, and its various responsible functionaries—when challenged from time to time, on this painful subject—have been somewhat forward in denying the existence in the British territory of any species of slavery, except in a very modified and almost patriarchal form. The inquiries instituted in—and the correspondence maintained with—the tributary states, by an odd accident, appear to have elicited the most valuable clue for guiding the investigation which it was necessary to prosecute in British India.

On the general subject of slavery in the East Indies we may observe, that a paper which was ordered on the 5th instant (September) by the House of Commons to be printed (No. 54) and which is entitled "Slavery (East Indies)" does not appear to us altogether satisfactory. The paper was moved for by Mr. W. B. Baring, and contains "A Copy of the Letter from the Governor-General of India in Council in the Legislative Department, dated May 10th, 1841, (No. 8.) and of the Minute of the Governor-General enclosed therein on the subject of Slavery in the East Indies." The letter, signed by the Earl of Auckland and five members of the Council,

appears to have covered the copy of the minute of the 8th of the same month. Lord Auckland's minute admits in express terms the existence of the evil; but that admission is coupled with a degree of apologetic extenuation as to the facts, which renders it difficult for us to infer any very decided anxiety on the part of his lordship to adopt a large or vigorous policy in repressing its growth, or extinguishing its conditions. His lordship declines to enter "into much detail" in pointing out the "generally mild character of what is termed slavery, or in marking how the agrestic servitude which exists in several of its districts" (as Malabar, Jamal, Districts of Madras, Behar province, &c.) "is connected chiefly with distinctions of caste, and will be upheld, notwithstanding any measures of the public authorities, by the force which natural habit and opinion have imparted to those distinctions."

A more quiet formula for cushioning the question of the deplorable result of these "distinctions," we can hardly imagine than these expressions convey. Where the supreme power of a state assumes that a particular condition of things will be upheld notwithstanding its own efforts to put it down, there is little hazard in predicting that the event, thus invited as it were, will assuredly verify the prediction. We cannot see how Lord Auckland establishes a case for the sort of non-intervention policy which he evidently advocates on this subject, by telling the world that "in Coorg, many of the slaves emancipated by government on its own estates have, from various causes, been led to destroy their certificates of freedom, and to place themselves again in servitude under their former masters." Surely this voluntary return into bondage is explicable, much more naturally and probably, on the theory that there is no demand for their labour from other quarters, or in other pursuits, which would yield them adequate means of subsisting themselves and their families—than on such an attachment to slavery in the abstract, or such a marvellous influence of caste, as must thus override the original inherent principles of human nature itself, older by countless ages than the earliest institutions into which the distinctions of caste were ever adopted. From innate tendencies to violence—from temperaments naturally excitable and never restrained sufficiently by education or accident, men have been said (perhaps absurdly, after all) to be born tyrants. But to suppose that any man is born with the predisposition to be a slave is not more monstrous than to imagine that free men, being free agents, will voluntarily return into slavery when they have once quitted it. In fact, the reasoning of the noble Governor-General is illogical throughout the greater part of the "minute" before us. He argues from particulars to generals. His *minor* is the text: his *major* the commentary. "In Malabar," says his lordship, "all the influence of the English proprietor of an estate cannot obtain for any of his labourers a greater degree of respect or privilege than the strict local usages of caste allow them: they remain, whatever the liberty of action which he accords to them, as degraded as before, for they cannot raise themselves above the low class to which they belong, and must mix only on the terms to which they have been accustomed with their caste brethren, the churmur slaves of the province."

Why then, what becomes of the noble earl's "mild character of what is termed slavery in India," if neither the mighty authority of English law, nor the vigour of that marvellous dominion which has flourished, now for nearly a century, in the moral grandeur of the English name and feeling, rather than in any adequate representation of English power in the handful of civilians, and of its military forces (accomplished, brave, and disciplined as these have been)—has been able to cope with the grinding despotism of "the local usages of caste." Supposing, for example, that these unmitted slaves be of the "Dher or Paria caste," mentioned at p. 3 of the minute. We all know that Hindoo superstition denies to this ill-fated class of its fellow-men the ordinary aids of all human sympathy, the manifestations of all human pity, the communication of fire, the gift of water, the sustenance of food, the solace of suffering, the balm of pity—under any circumstances where the pollution of contact with these outcasts of the family of man is to be apprehended by their higher-caste countrymen. Yet they have been often emancipated for their good and faithful conduct to European masters and christian teachers. Shall these reclaimed children of wrath (as we might well term them, looking to the almost inconceivable cruelty of the doom pronounced against them by the debasing institutes of a monstrous combination—a theocratic oligarchy)—shall they be driven back into the toils from whence a principle of European justice has set them free, out of respect and delicacy for the most wanton excess of the wildest pretensions ever advanced by idolatrous priestcraft?

Our limits will not allow us to pursue this part of the subject any further, however, because we are now to produce some other evidence—supplied by our Indian government itself, which militates much more powerfully against the "far niente" policy of Lord Auckland on this question—(we have no such charge, unhappily, to bring against his territorial ventures)—than any protest of ours can do.

We have already shown that his lordship considers the character of agrestic slavery to be mild in India. But in another passage (p. 2.) he holds that, "in effect, that which constitutes the essence of slavery may be said to have been already abolished nearly everywhere throughout India. I mean by that essence, an entire subjection, sanctioned and upheld by the law, of an individual and his family to the will of a master, and the absolute claim of property, with the right also, and the means of enforcing that claim, of one man over another."

This declaration has surprised us; and the rather that it is almost coincident with the reprinted revelations comprised in the "Report on Slavery in the East Indies," originally promulgated by the East India Company, and containing those allegations which were cited in the House of Lords last week, in the course of the discussion originated by Lord Brougham. "The slavery" (according to this report "prevailing in the territories subject to the Bengal presidency may be traced to several sources.

"1. The sale or gift of children by their parents or other natural guardians.

"2. The sale of children and adults by their mothers or maternal relations.

"3. The sale of wives by their husbands.

"4. The self-sale of adults.

"5. Marriage or cohabitation with a slave.

"6. Kidnapping.

"7. Importation.

"8. Birth."

Who can doubt, on perusing this classification of the form and modes of a practice so various as to require to be classified, that "the character of agrestic slavery" (to which the victims are thus devoted wholesale) is very "mild" in India, or that, "essentially," the practice of slavery "may be said to be already abolished?" We have not room for the horrible "details" of which Lord Auckland speaks so languidly, derived as they are from the most unquestionable authorities, that would illustrate the excesses on the one hand, the sufferings on the other, to which these different modes of slavery inevitably tend. We must refer all those who are desirous of more minute information on the point to Hamilton, Buchanan, the Nizamut Adawlut Reports, the columns of the *Asiatic Journal*, &c.

Let us only oppose some fearful contradictions to his lordship's theory.

"The practice certainly exists in some parts; and, wherever it does occur, the victims are generally female children, who are entrapped and sold, sometimes to Mohammedans for concubines or servants in their zenanas, but principally to procuresses to supply the demands of their profession."

But there is also a kidnapping of men for the "mild condition" of "agrestic slavery" mentioned by the Governor-general. Thus (p. 15)

"Marriage or cohabitation with a slave.

"In Tipperah sometimes the consideration for which a freeman gives himself up to slavery is marriage with a slave girl, whom the master will not permit him to marry on other terms.

"In Rujeshahy a free female on marrying with a slave descends to his condition.

"In Purneah a freeman by marrying a slave girl is personally degraded to slavery, but cannot be sold; and the same, according to Dr. Buchanan, is the case in some parts of Bhaugulpore.

"One witness states, that in all the territories west of Benares if a free man marries a slave he becomes the slave of his wife's owner, for so long as he cohabits with her, but he may put an end to his servitude at any time by relinquishing his wife. But if a free woman marries a slave she becomes permanently the slave of her husband's master."

More horrible, by far, is the lot of the weaker sex:—

"In the neighbourhood of Calcutta, not only are female children kidnapped, but grown up and married women are inveigled from their families, and sold in the city to replenish the brothels, as will be further mentioned under the head of 'Prostitution.'

"In the city and district of Dacca, in 1816, the persons sold in slavery were generally young female children or grown-up girls, decoyed away from their parents or other relations in the country under pretext of marriage or other pretence, and disposed of either to public women, or to rich individuals as servants for their zenanas. This description of offence was believed by the magistrate of the city to be very frequent, though few cases of the kind were brought officially to notice."

Again—

"The appalling system called *megpunnahism* has recently been brought to light in the western provinces, of murdering indigent parents for the sake of obtaining their children."—p. 16.

But a sense of what is due to decorum and decency absolutely withholds us from making further extracts under this head, and that of "dancing girls," to show what is the character of slavery in India other than "agrestic." Let us, then, finally, turn to Lord Auckland's "minute," and mark the terms of indignant and stern reprobation in which he, doubtlessly, denounces these disgraceful and revolting crimes of daily occurrence within the vast limits of his jurisdiction—

"I would for the present be content with legislation to the effect which I have above stated. Compulsory contracts or transfers with a view to prostitution would, I apprehend, be void and punishable under the existing law. We shall have a better guarantee for good treatment and easy emancipation at the wish of the slave, in the protection from any personal restraint which the law to which I have assented will confer upon him, than in express rules of the kind proposed by the commissioners. In a word I would legislate as little as possible now," &c.

Is this the language of indifference and apathy, or the cautious but far-seeing reserve of profound statesmanship? We know not. But this we know—that, verily, it is high time that something were done to vindicate the christianity and morality—as well as the political power and influence, of Great Britain in India!

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN TUNIS.

To the Editor of the *Anti-slavery Reporter*.

Malta, 27th September, 1841.

DEAR SIR,—I hope you will not fail to notice the laudable act of the Bey of Tunis, in taking the preliminary steps for the total abolition of slavery in the regency. You will find an account of this philanthropic act of his highness in the *Malta Times* of the 25th instant. Sir Thomas Reade, Her Britannic Majesty's consul-general in Tunis, has greatly exerted himself in this good work, using every effort to persuade the Bey thereto, and therefore deserving great praise from the christian public. It appears a very extraordinary thing that no efforts are made to induce the Sultan of Constantinople to put a stop to slavery. This conduct of his vassal in Tunis ought to make the divan blush.

I am, dear sir, yours truly.

JAMES RICHARDSON.

The following is the article in the *Malta Times* :—

We are most happy to hear that the sinister and puerile prognostications of some persons, who ought to have been better informed, respecting the Bey's intentions of abolishing slavery in his extensive and important territories, have completely, and most fortunately for the interests of humanity, failed—nay, have been signally belied. Our correspondent of the 16th instant informs us :—

The Bey's conduct above alluded to is, that he has abolished all the public slave-markets in the regency, THE BUILDINGS OF WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN ABSOLUTELY PULLED DOWN; he has prohibited, under severe pains and penalties, the public sale of any slave; and I have no doubt that he will ultimately emancipate every slave in the regency.

"But it must be observed that he has great difficulties to overcome for there are many proprietors of slaves who possess from two to three thousand each, and who naturally look for indemnification in some mode or other, whenever their emancipation may be effected."

From this it will appear that the Dey is a much calumniated person, whereas he has given an example of noble philanthropy to all the Ottoman countries in Asia and Africa, nay, a lesson of virtue and charity to the boasted civilizers of Africa, the "patrons and inventors of razias;" in Algiers.

We are opportunely informed that the clique of slavery-patronizing French merchants in Tunis are hatching some calumnies against the *Malta Times*, and even against Lord Palmerston, for our insertion of an article on the dismissal of M. Gaspary, who some time ago, nefariously and secretly occupied himself in the embarkation of slaves at Tunis for Greece. We wish them all success in their infamous attempts to blacken the character of those who seek, for the honour as well as for the relieving of the miseries of the human race, the abolition of the inhuman, the diabolical system of slavery: but we have the means at hand, of completely exposing to the odium of the world these calumniators.

We repeat again our former observation, that any man caught in the nefarious practice of slave-dealing is unworthy of all confidence, much less ought he to be trusted with the consular affairs of christian, or any other nations; but such is the case of M. Gaspary. *Confessedly, however, the virtue of Frenchmen and Italians at Tunis is at a low ebb.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Subscriptions and Donations to the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to the Treasurer (G. W. Alexander, Esq.) at the Society's Office, 27, New Broad Street, London.

Communications for the Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* also should be sent to the Office of the Society, as above.

HINTS TO FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS.

As the committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society have now a considerable number of correspondents in various parts of the world—a class of coadjutors of which they desire a continual augmentation, they beg to draw attention to a few hints, by regarding which their friends would render their communications of the utmost possible value, and their help to the anti-slavery cause of the greatest efficiency.

The subjects on which the committee particularly desire information are the following.

Any recent facts or statistics respecting the slave-trade or slavery as connected with particular countries, with the authority on which such facts or statistics are given.

The titles of any publications, especially of government documents, which throw any light on subjects of this class. The committee would be obliged by such particulars as should distinctly mark out the works intended (such as author's name, publisher's name, place and date of publication, if to be obtained in London, &c.), and by some general account of their contents and merits. Should works of considerable importance appear, the committee would be glad to have a copy immediately transmitted to them. Others might be forwarded as opportunity should serve.

Any measures which may have been recently adopted for promoting the objects contemplated by the Anti-slavery Society; whether by the circulation of information by books, lectures, and public meetings, or otherwise.

Whether any applications have been made to government, or to persons in authority, for the abolition of slavery or the slave-trade; or any steps taken preliminary to such application.

Should the committee have the pleasure of receiving communications from new correspondents (a favour which they earnestly request) they would desire to be informed of the general state of the slavery question in the country in which their correspondent may reside—the extent of slavery and the slave-trade—the laws affecting them—and the actual state of both. They would be glad, also to receive copies of all works published on these subjects up to the present time, and to be informed of the probable extent of their circulation and influence. To this should be added an account of any existing Anti-slavery Associations, with the names of their officers, &c.

The committee would be happy, finally, to learn from their correspondents in what manner (whether by information or otherwise) assistance in promoting the good cause can be rendered them. As far as practicable, it will be readily and gladly afforded.

Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, OCTOBER 20TH.

A DEPUTATION of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Committee, consisting of Messrs. Josiah Forster, John Beaumont, Joseph Cooper, John Scoble, Thomas Bax, and Robert Rouse, waited yesterday on the Earl of Aberdeen, at the Foreign Office. They were very courteously received, and held conference with his lordship in reference to the Mendians captured in the *Amistad*, the treaty with Texas, and other matters connected with slavery and the slave-trade.

We seized the opportunity of announcing by a postscript, in our last number, the important speech which was delivered by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords on the 5th inst. It related principally to the state of the law, as it affects British subjects engaging in the slave-trade; and more especially to the question whether share-holders in properties (whether plantations or mines) for the cultivation or working of which slaves are purchased, are guilty of the offence of slave-trading within the meaning of the British statute. Although his lordship did not

affirm this subject to be absolutely free from doubt, he declares his own opinion to be that all such parties are violators of the law. And he recommended that a proclamation should be issued, warning all persons who had unwarily become implicated in this offence, and giving them time to withdraw themselves from these illegal partnerships. Should the opinion of the legal advisers of the crown concur with that of Lord Brougham—of which it is reported there is a high probability—such a proclamation, perhaps, may shortly be expected. But, should it be otherwise, the matter will not rest where it is. The facts are admitted on all hands to be so directly in violation of the spirit of the law, that, if the present statute cannot reach the guilty parties, a declaratory act will be introduced for the purpose. We suppose the directors and share-holders of the Cuban and Brazilian Mining Associations will now look to themselves. The loud call of humanity and justice, we are sorry to say, they have despised; but, unless they wash their hands of this wickedness now, an indictment for felony by the law officers of the government hangs over the head of every one of them. We hear that one of the mining companies is taking measures to sell their slaves; and we should not be surprised to hear of a panic among the proprietors eager to sell their shares. But this will not do. Neither shares nor slaves must be sold. THE SLAVES MUST BE SET FREE, AND THE SHARE-HOLDERS MUST DEMAND IT.

We cannot conclude these remarks without expressing our gratification that the speech of Lord Brougham is published in a cheap form. It should be most unsparingly distributed. It is thus characterized by a writer in the *Morning Herald*.

The noble and learned lord is ever in his happiest mood where the dignity of a great moral principle is to be asserted against the pretensions of mere private interest. He enforced, accordingly, his protest against this violation of the spirit of imperial statutes which had been passed with the most solemn formalities of British legislation—in a strain of indignant and flowing eloquence. In moving that the reports of Dr. Madden on the slave-trade be laid upon the table, Lord Brougham powerfully impressed upon the peers who were present—(few in number, undoubtedly, they were,) that the locality in which British subjects maintained, or mixed, themselves up with, the traffic in slaves, could not alter the character of their offence, or the nature of their responsibility for it, under those memorable acts of the British parliament which had been passed for its suppression and extinction. If they were "British subjects"—these capitalists, whether they were engaged in mining operations, in the Brazils, or in the raising of produce in the East Indies, by the aid of slave-labour; came, equally, within the spirit of the penal laws which had been passed for the prohibition and prevention of this frightful traffic. His lordship enforced his argument by the most powerful of all illustration—drawn from the practical evils which result, in both hemispheres, from this illegal diversion of British capital. The terrible destruction of human life which attends the capture, the supply, and the transport of African slaves to South America, is aggravated by the cruelties which are visited on those who unfortunately survive to an existence of hopeless consuming labour—unpitied suffering—unrewarded toil—and unmitigated despair. The atrocities practised on the slave-producers of sugar, opium, and indigo, in some of the regions of India are of a character revolting to the feelings of our common nature.

In refusing the papers called for, the Earl of Ripon unquestionably assigned ample reasons for the prudent course adopted by the government; and Lord Brougham, in thereupon withdrawing his motion, gave a satisfactory proof of the sincerity of the zeal with which he had vindicated the principle of the Slave Abolition Law. He disdained to lower the lofty character of the cause he thus advocated, by converting it into a means of obstructing the course of public business. For our own parts, we believe that the noble lord's address, on this momentous subject, will produce a salutary effect. The tone which pervaded it, and the manner in which it was responded to by one of the ablest as well as most honest ministers of the crown, must convince those Englishmen whom the excitement of commercial enterprise may have precipitated into connexions with such associations, of a fact, which they cannot too maturely deliberate upon. However great the temptations of profit they may hold out to the adventurers in them, the British capitalist will certainly lose caste among his countrymen who will attempt to advance his private fortunes in foreign establishments, by secret evasion, or open defiance of the laws of his native country, against the objects to which those establishments are devoted, or the means by which such objects are accomplished.

OUR paper to-day contains matter of great importance, respecting slavery in British India. The report on this subject of the Indian Law Commissioners, which has been laid before parliament, and is thus in the hands of the British public, has, it appears been taken into consideration by the Indian government, and a parliamentary paper has just been issued, conveying in an official minute, the sentiments of the governor-general, (Lord Auckland,) in relation to it. We have gone fully into the merits of this important document elsewhere—here we shall only say that the question is now evidently becoming one of practical dealing, and is taking a shape fitted to excite the deepest public interest. It is announced that Lord Auckland will probably be succeeded in the governor-generalship of India by Lord Ellenborough. We hope his appointment will give birth to no impediments to the abolition of slavery there.

WE must direct the particular attention of our readers to the intelligence which they will find in another column respecting Texas. It appears—and, for the sake of the character of the British nation, we rejoice to learn is—that Lord Palmerston's diplomacy respecting this country has not attained its object. The government of Mexico has refused the mediation of England, and resists the recognition of Texan independence on any terms. It is at once a deep humiliation to a British minister, and a noble act of homage

to benevolence and virtue, that the Mexican government should lay the stress of this decision on the establishment of slavery by Texas—a crime which Mexico is resolved never again to recognise. After such an answer, Lord Palmerston, no doubt, thought it prudent to avoid the ratification of the treaty with General Hamilton.

This position of affairs will, of course, put a check on the lending of money to the Texan government, and on emigration to the Texan soil. Our countrymen are leaving their native shores for purposes of peaceful industry, and not for a land in which their first business may be compulsory military service, and their constant hazard the irruption of an invading army.

OUR readers will see with great interest another letter from our valuable and well-informed correspondent in Cuba. The movement in that island, and the movements of the two governments which give origin to it, are of great importance and promise. The murderous and piratical character which the Cuban slave-traders are now assuming is neither a fiction nor a trifle. Of the affair referred to in our correspondent's letter the official particulars have not arrived; but we have learned, on unquestionable authority that four boats and forty men were sent by one of her Majesty's cruisers on the coast of Africa to cut out the *Irene* slaver from the river Gallinas, and that both boats and crews were entirely destroyed. Such are the melancholy results of the crisis to which the system of armed suppression is driving this fearful traffic.

WE direct attention to a valuable letter received by Mr. G. W. Alexander from a correspondent in Holland. Its contents are of great interest and importance.

FROM Mauritius—whence we can obtain so few trust-worthy accounts—we have been favoured with an extract of a letter to Mr. Tredgold. It is from a gentleman eminently worthy of confidence, and is, unhappily, of painful interest.

Port Louis, 8th July, 1841.

I am anxious to direct your attention to an ordinance you will find published in the *Cerfien* of July 7th, respecting the hiring of servants. It is an appropriate appendix to our vagrant laws, which prohibit a labourer from moving from place to place without a police permit about his person. It prohibits him from hiring himself to labour, and from labouring, without a certificate. It places a tremendous power in the hands of the stipendiary magistrates, who can find a thousand pretexts for refusing the certificates, and keeping the blacks on their present locations. The spirit of olden times breathes in this ordinance. With reluctance is the labourer allowed the least measure of personal liberty. He may be secured apparently by equal laws, in the legal form of his contracts of service, &c.; but this is all a mockery, so long as he is not allowed to maintain by all lawful means his right to better his condition, and to rise according to his talents and industry. Allow him to seek liberty for himself, and he will secure the blessing in the best possible way, and without any injury to society: but withhold this labourer's charter from him, by requisitions of permits to move about and certificates to carry about with him in search of labour, and you infallibly create in his mind suspicion and disgust. And by these interferences with the natural circulation of capital and labour, incalculable injury is inflicted on both the capitalist and the labourer. I should like to see more prominence given in the columns of the *Reporter* to the superiority of a negative and leave-alone legislation, over a positive and fictitious administration of government. Little good can be effected by preceptive laws, even under the administration of an upright and humane man; but immense evil may be effected under that of a wicked man.

In the present case I am not without hope that the law will prove to have overstepped a prudent moderation, and will thereby remedy its own mischief, by so completely disgusting the whites with the much-loved *contrats de service* as to make them cease to enforce them upon the labourers, preferring the precariousness of day labour to the endless annoyances and dangers of the contract system. This would tend more than any and all the enactments and devices which a world (if such a world could exist) of lawyers could concoct, to bring about a satisfactory and prosperous state of things in regard to capital and labour.

The Coolies may, I admit, and some few of them do, better their condition at Mauritius. But, if they come as free men, they have a right to the fullest advantages which the circumstances of the colony offer to the labourer; and those advantages they are not and never have been allowed (in their full extent) to enjoy; neither are the Madagascar labourers, or the Creole, or any other labourers. They are all liable to be seized on the highway, and shut up in prison for being without a passport; to be clapped into the *Bagne* for having no place; or for leaving one, or for seeking one, or for accepting one—without the certificate.

We further solicit attention to an important article in our present number on the *Coolie Slave Trade*.

THE series of papers on the slave-trade for the past year, just put forth from the parliamentary press, contains both a large quantity and a great variety of important and interesting matter. We shall avail ourselves of it with as much promptness as possible. In the present number will be found some extracts relating to the state of slavery in Turkey, and the slave-trade which, it appears, is carried on to a great extent between Constantinople and the Barbary coast. The attitude assumed by her Majesty's late government and their *employés* in the Mediterranean on this subject is highly gratifying and praise-worthy; and we wish in the strongest manner to express our sense of it. The efforts of Sir Thomas Reade in Tunis, appear to have been followed with very pleasing results; as the Bey of that regency is stated to have taken measures of an effectual kind for the abolition of the inhuman traffic. What a lesson will this "barbarian" read to the heads of civilized governments!

We take with pleasure this opportunity of acknowledging the very handsome manner in which Lord Palmerston conveyed to Lord Ponsonby, the address of the General Anti-slavery Convention. At the same time we may make our acknowledgments also, for the terms in which the memorial of the Convention on the holding of slaves by British functionaries abroad was communicated by his lordship to all the parties concerned.

WE have been favoured with a copy of the *Dublin Morning Register*, by which we perceive that our friends of the Hibernian Anti-slavery Society have been drawing public attention in that city to the frightful implication of British subjects in the atrocities of the slave-trade. A meeting was held recently at the Royal Exchange, Dublin, at which the following petition was agreed to, to be presented to both Houses of Parliament.

TO THE COMMONS AND PEERS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The Petition from a Public Meeting, held in the Royal Exchange, Dublin,

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—That your petitioners approach you with the mournful conviction that, notwithstanding the abolition of the slave-trade by the British legislature in 1808, it has vastly increased since that period, not only in extent, but in the dreadful atrocities which are practised on its victims; and they are fully and painfully convinced that British capital and British enterprise are amongst the main supports of the iniquitous system.

As evidence of this your petitioners refer to the facts—that several companies have been formed in England, carrying on their operations in the Brazils and Cuba, which have their mines worked principally by slaves, the greater part of whom, in additional aggravation, have been illicitly imported since such importation has been declared piratical—that officers in the British army and navy, as well as in the civil service, are connected with, and engaged in, these mines—that branches of English banking companies are formed, or about to be formed, in those countries where the mines are situated, evidently for supplying means to carry on the slave-trade—that enormous quantities of goods are manufactured in England, which are used solely in the slave trade—that fetters and shackles are manufactured there for a similar purpose—and that there is good reason to believe that vessels have been built and prepared in ports of England purposely as slave ships.

Your petitioners feel it to be their duty to bring these deeply disgraceful facts before your notice—they earnestly urge them on your attention. They believe that, so long as slavery exists, it will be in vain to seek to put an end to the slave trade.

Signed on behalf of the meeting,

"RICHARD D. WEBB, Chairman.

"29th September, 1841."

SUCH of our readers as may be interested in the winding up of the accounts of the Central Negro Emancipation Committee we beg to direct to our last page, where they will find a clear and very satisfactory statement in relation to this matter.

THE COOLIE SLAVE-TRADE.

SUBSEQUENTLY to the defeat of Lord John Russell's motion last year, to relax the prohibition laid by the supreme government of India, on the export of Coolies to Mauritius and elsewhere, in consequence of the fearful abuses which had attended the measure, and which all the police regulations they could devise had neither been able to correct or control, several important documents have been laid before Parliament relative thereto, which fully justify the course which had been taken, and render it imperative that the prohibition should be continued.

The argument raised by the Mauritian planters, that the prohibition interferes with the rights of the Indian labouring population, is met by the fact, that that population, so far from desiring to emigrate from their native land to distant and foreign parts, are utterly averse to it. They even object to go to distant and unknown sections of their own country, although allured by the company's servants, under the promise of constant employment, good wages, land for tillage, and ample protection. We have an instance of this in a communication of Captain T. Wilkinson, agent to the governor-general, south-western frontier, to N. Willieh, Esq., secretary to the tea company, dated 20th February, 1839. Captain Wilkinson states, that after having offered the Coolies if they would proceed to Assam for the cultivation of tea, "they would never receive less than three rupees per mensem, for their labour, and would be allowed land to cultivate, free of expense, for a period of five years, and have their travelling expenses to Assam paid at the rate of two rupees per mensem," states that they refused on the ground that they were not "willing to go to a country which they cannot ascertain has been visited by any of their brethren. They also expressed fears that I might be endeavouring to procure them to send them beyond sea, as several had been sent from Calcutta by gentlemen." Another of the company's servants, J. Davidson, Esq., in a letter to Dr. Wallich, dated 30th March, 1839, says, that, after having endeavoured to obtain Coolies to go to Assam "entirely without success," the idea that they "are willing to expatriate themselves is directly the reverse of the fact," as no people are "more attached to their own country than the Coolies, and with reason." It should also be observed, that, of all the thousands who have hitherto gone to Mauritius, or other colonies, there is no proof afforded that any of them went voluntarily; but, on the contrary, decisive evidence that they were either kidnapped for that purpose, and by force put on board vessels employed in transporting them, or were obtained by the most fraudulent statements, such as, that they were wanted for the "company's *Rabustie*," and that agency

houses in Calcutta, crimps and police, were all parties to the infamous transactions. Even the governor-general, who is now willing to relax the prohibition partially, observes in a minute, dated 25th April, 1841, "I do not believe that this law (the prohibitory act) is yet felt as pressing hardly upon the rights and interests of the natives of India." The fact is the law is protective merely—protective of the liberty and happiness of the Indian population, and it will certainly be time enough to repeal it when they feel it to be a grievance.

But the Mauritian planters want labourers to extend their cultivation and increase their riches, and they consider it an infringement of their rights to restrict the labour market to them, by a prohibitory law, having reference to Indian labourers. The reply to this is, that they shut that market themselves. They did not obtain the labourers by fair means, but by foul. The most atrocious practices were resorted to, year after year, by their agents in India, until the evil of their doings became so glaring, and monstrous, and incurable, that they were absolutely forbidden to resort thither for more victims to satisfy their love of gain. The rights of Mauritian planters! Men who never respected the rights of others, should be modest in speaking of their own. They should remember that the miserable remnant of labourers they impiously claimed as their property, up to the period when the abolition act delivered them from their oppressors, were the victims of an atrocious slave-trade, carried on by themselves in defiance of all laws human and divine. They should remember that to them belongs the bad pre-eminence of having resisted to the last, the abolition of the apprenticeship, second only in horror to the system of slavery itself, and which was enforced by them by a more dreadful severity than by any other oppressors in the whole of the British colonies. They should remember that the Coolies they have already in possession, were obtained by force or fraud, when they talk to us of their rights. Had they recruited their population in the first instance, by honourable means, had they introduced the Indian labourers into their colony as freemen—free to choose their own masters, and free to demand the current wages that were given—had they legislated in the spirit of the Abolition Act, to meet the altered state of the colony—had they treated their emancipated slaves with justice, the probability is, that, under proper restrictions, they would have been allowed a free resort to British India, for such additional labour as they might want; but on all these points they have shown that they are neither to be trusted by the British government nor by the British people; and they must take the consequences of their own acts.

But to return to the official papers referred to in the opening paragraph of this article.

1. The first, No. 331, 1840, contains "copies of correspondence addressed by the Secretary of State for the colonial department, relative to the introduction of Indian labourers into Mauritius; and of the report of the commissioners of inquiry into the present condition of those already located in the colony." An analysis of this paper appeared in the *Reporter* of last year. From it we gathered that on twenty-two estates out of thirty, that were visited by the commissioners, serious complaints were made by the Coolies. It also appeared by the same document, that out of 25,000 Coolies introduced in four years, 7000 had perished! In a previous Parliamentary return, No. 58, 1840, the mortality at Port Louis, was stated to be from 8 to 9 per cent. per annum, and that out of 19,050 Coolies, which had then been introduced, only 205 were women! In both these documents, it was proved that the generality of the abodes of the Coolies were wretched, that the hospital accommodations were, in most instances, abominable—that they were sometimes coerced to labour—that their services were transferred from one master to another, by *sale for a pecuniary profit*—that they were obliged to obtain a "*billet de passe*," to go beyond the estates to which they were attached during out-of-work hours—that they were mulcted *two days' wages for one day's absence*,—and, were subject to various other "horrid abuses," to use the language of one of the gentlemen engaged in the examination.

2. The next Parliamentary Paper, No. 45, 1841, contains "copies of a letter from the secretary to the government of India, to the committee appointed to inquire respecting the export of Hill Coolies, dated 1st day of August, 1838—of the report made by the committee, with the minutes and appendix—of any minute recorded on that report by any member of the committee—of the letters from the government of India, to the Court of Directors of the East India Company, dated the 16th and 19th days of October, 1840, on the same subject." The evidence contained in this important document decided the government of India as to the course which it was bound in honour and humanity to pursue, and led to the prohibition so often referred to. In the report of the committee, they say "we conceive it to be distinctly proved beyond dispute, that the Coolies and other natives exported to Mauritius and elsewhere, were, generally speaking, induced to come to Calcutta, by misrepresentation and deceit, practised upon them by native crimps, styled duffadars and arkotties, employed by European and Anglo-Indian undertakers and shippers, who were mostly cognizant of these frauds, and who received a very considerable sumper head for each Coolie exported." "That kidnapping prevailed to a very considerable extent; and the Coolies while kept in Calcutta itself, and its neighbourhood, were actually in a state of close imprisonment." "That whatever measures were adopted by the police, were completely ineffectual as a check upon these abuses." "That the

police regulations of Mauritius, were of not much greater practical utility in restraining illegal importations of Coolies." "That the hardships and miseries endured by the Coolies in the passage to Mauritius, were very great; and the mortality from drowning, (suicide, &c.) and other causes, was most serious—not much short," they add, "of ten per cent, on the numbers exported." They then submit certain suggestions to the government to prevent abuses in future, in closing which, they observe, "We have framed these suggestions, not without a hope, that if our views of regulating to the full extent pointed out, shall be adopted, the trade would be abandoned as unprofitable by all parties now engaged in it. And we repeat, that while we are of opinion that even such laws as those would not be wholly effectual in extinguishing abuses, if the exportation of Coolies should be carried on in great numbers, yet we believe that if adopted, it is unlikely that the exportation of Coolies would afterwards go on to any great extent, and then abuses might become manageable." The facts collected in the evidence were of the most painful kind. We need not dwell on them as they are well known. One of the witnesses examined by the committee as to the condition of the Coolies in Mauritius, made the following remarkable statement, which proves that the planters are as opposed to the education of the wretched Coolies, as they were reckless of the means by which they obtained them. Mr. Onslow says, "I may mention, with reference to the civilization and well-being of the Coolies, that means which had been taken to promote their spiritual welfare in Mauritius were, for some reasons prevented from being carried into effect, by, I believe, the government of the Mauritius. An impression existed, I understand, that the preaching of missionaries had a tendency to render people of the class of Coolies discontented with their situation and their masters."

In concluding their valuable report, the committee observe, "We have a full trust, that the benevolent and commanding intellects employed in the consideration of the whole subject in England, both within parliament and out of it, cannot fail to lead the legislature to right conclusions; and we rest humbly confident in the conclusion, that whatever may be the result, parliament and the people of England will duly protect the emancipated African from all competition in the wages of labour and means of subsistence that is not free, fair, and unaided by local power; and will not permit injustice to be done to the Indian subjects of the crown, (though of a poor and friendless class,) from any motives of political advantage, however weighty, or of mercantile gain, however large."

3. The third series of documents printed by order of parliament, No. 427, 1841, contains "copy of Mr. J. P. Grant's minute on the abuses alleged to exist in the export of Coolies, and an appendix, containing the examination of Coolies returned from Mauritius to Calcutta. The object of Mr. Grant is to obtain the relaxation of the prohibition laid by the government of India on the export of Coolies to Mauritius, on the ground that the whole of the labouring population of the vast portion of her Majesty's territories entrusted to the government of the East India company, ought to be as free as the rest of her Majesty's subjects in respect to the disposal of their labour, and their right of going about." It is material, however, to observe, that Mr. Grant fully admits the correctness of the statements contained in the report of the committee, before adverted to, as to the manner in which the Coolie trade was carried on, the treatment of the labourers before embarkation, and the treatment to which they were generally subject in Mauritius. "In these particulars," Mr. Grant says, "so far from objecting to the opinions of the majority, if I had agreed in the conclusion of the report, and so been competent to sign it, I should have felt it my duty to move for a more pointed expression of opinion in certain respects." Notwithstanding, however, this important admission, he is the advocate for Coolie emigration to Mauritius under certain regulations, which he proposes. He would limit the emigration to certain ports. At these ports, he would have a protector of Indian emigrants. He would have the labourer fully understand what he undertakes. He would institute a registry of certificates granted. He would not allow the Coolies to be shipped in batches. He would give the Coolie the opportunity of changing his mind at any time previous to the sailing of the emigrant vessels. He would have security that the labourers should return to their native land. He suggests that a law of the imperial legislature would be necessary to insure on the part of the owners of vessels obedience to such regulations as the Indian government might frame; and that to prevent smuggling, British vessels every where might be liable to search by men-of-war, and subjected to heavy punishment if found to have Coolies on board improperly obtained. He also recommends that permission might be refused by the government of India to ship emigrants to any colony, (Bourbon for instance,) where the law applicable to emigrants is not in all respects such as is suitable to freemen of that class. Other regulations, more or less stringent, to take effect in Mauritius, are suggested by Mr. Grant, and with such limitations and restrictions as he proposes he thinks the system may be permitted. How far his regulations qualify the proposition on which he bases his willingness to allow of emigration we will not stop to inquire. If his argument had reference exclusively to the spontaneous emigration of skilled labourers, whose acts were perfectly voluntary, we could understand it, but as he would apply it to the ignorant and unwary, we must say, with the facts before us, it is perfectly inconclusive, and as to the regulations which he suggests, we think it sufficient to quote from the Governor-general's minute of the 25th of April, 1841, the follow-

ing extract, to show their inefficiency. His lordship says, "I greatly fear no strictness of regulation, and no vigilance on the part of the authorities, would immediately prevent the frequent infliction of grievous oppressions and deceits upon large number of persons helpless from their poverty, and from their ignorance and inexperience." It is to protect these that we advocate the continuance of the prohibition. And as to the police, to whose hands this matter must be left, his lordship adds, "It is but too true, that this branch of our service is most defective and ineffective, and the different experiments which have been tried for its reform have greatly ended in disappointment." But among the regulations of Mr. Grant, we do not find one that has reference to an equality of the sexes among the emigrants. We presume the reason for this will be found in the utter unwillingness of the female sex to leave their native homes. Yet it will, perhaps, not be improper to inquire what may become of the wives and children of emigrant Coolies, when their husbands and fathers are taken from them? In the appendix to the report of the committee, some light is thrown upon this subject. These gentlemen had been able to trace the history of many families after the departure of their relatives to Mauritius, and this is the melancholy account: "At present their families, for want of food, are begging from door to door"—"family is in great distress for maintenance"—"starving for want of food"—"their families have taken menial service (qy. become slaves!) for maintenance." And these remarks are not confined to a family here and there, but are applicable to a great extent to all the families left at home by the Coolies on their shipment for Mauritius. Now, two evils are inflicted by the wholesale removal of males; first, the injury inflicted on the miserable families they leave behind; and, secondly, the demoralization they necessarily carry with them. To dwell on this point is unnecessary. The introduction of 30,000 or 40,000 males of the Mohammedan and idolatrous population of Hindostan into the midst of the labouring community of Mauritius—subject to none, or but few of those moral restraints which Christianity inculcates, must be an evil of frightful magnitude, in whatever point of view it be regarded.

In connexion with Mr. Grant's minute, we find the evidence of 113 Coolies, who have returned to Calcutta, after the expiry of their indentures. They were examined principally by Mr. M'Farlan, police magistrate, occasionally assisted by Mr. Grant, Mr. Downson, and Russomoy Dutt, a native gentleman. The mode in which they were examined is extremely unsatisfactory. No uniformity in the questions proposed to the Coolies was observed, except to elicit what might be deemed favourable to the Mauritian planters, and to the scheme of emigration. In the examination, both Mr. Grant and Mr. M'Farlan show themselves decided partisans. As to Mr. Downson, he was directly engaged in shipping Coolies to Mauritius, as may be seen by parliamentary papers 45, 1841, p. 75. In his deposition before the committee of inquiry he admits that his house shipped 6000 Coolies to Mauritius, and 51 to Bourbon. This man pretended not to know how his subordinate agents obtained the Coolies, or whether they were confined by his duffadars previously to embarkation, but confessed that, on one occasion, he had 140 in his own compound, guarded by brijabassis for no purposes whatever, certainly not to prevent the Coolies from going whithersoever they pleased. It appears, however, that the great gates of the compound were always kept closed, and that after four or five weeks confinement, the Coolies mutinied and fought their way out of the place, to the no small regret of Mr. Downson, who had made some advances to them. But to return to the evidence of the Coolies. The fact that they returned with money in their pockets, some after a residence of five years, and some after they had served a period of six years, with from 10 to 300 rupees each, is paraded in the examination as a most convincing proof of the excellent treatment they received. Now an ordinary Coolie's wages, at five rupees per month, would amount to sixty rupees per year, and in five years to 300 rupees; whilst that of a sirdar or head servant, at seven to ten rupees per month, would of course be in proportion. In analyzing, however, the amount said to have been brought by 123 Coolies to Calcutta, we find the result to be as follows, viz., 26 with 60 rupees and under, 34 with 120 rupees and under, 23 with 180 rupees and under, 17 with 240 rupees and under, 17 with 300 rupees and under, 1 with 350 rupees, another 354 rupees, and a third 400 rupees; whilst three appear to have brought none away with them. Upon a close examination we find that those with the larger sums were mostly the sirdars or headmen, or Coolies who had wives and children that could assist them in labour, or persons who added to their stock by trading, &c. It should also be observed, that in the sums brought home with them, was included the amount kept back, one rupee per month, as a deposit in case they should become diseased or incorrigible, and be sent back to India before the expiry of their indentures. The test, however, we would apply is their willingness to return to Mauritius. On this point the examinations give us the following results—three state they would go back—these were sirdars, or persons who had been instructed to bring labourers back to the Mauritius with them; ten doubtful—perhaps they might go back, cannot tell whether they might go back, and such like answers; eighteen would not return, the remainder either gave no answers upon the point, or were not questioned. Among those who gave a decided negative, we find several who brought away the largest amounts of money. In their examinations the Coolies are almost invariably represented as having no complaints, and yet we find many among them

making the following statements: "They exact hard labour"—"I was flogged for not working properly."—"He was beat."—"He was beat if he did not do his work."—"We were occasionally beaten, but not after we learned our business."—"We were allowed very little, only about three-eighths of a seer (of rice) a day."—"We were told that we were engaged to do the company's work."—"If they had not supposed they were going to serve the company they would not have gone."—"On Sundays we did not work after eight o'clock in the morning."—"On Sundays we got our week's rations."—"At ten o'clock, A.M., we had an hour allowed to eat our dinners; that was the only rest we were allowed in the day."—"On Sundays, when we mixed with other Coolies, we heard complaints of ill-treatment from some; they complained that as a punishment, their hands were tied behind them and they were whipped with the mule whip, and their feet were put in stocks."—"He, (the sirdar) practised oppression upon us."—"When we complained to the master, he used to say to him, that for not working we were beat. He used to take bribes from us, I paid two rupees three times to him."—"After eight o'clock, (on Sundays) we had a pass if we wanted to go out; without a pass the police would stop us and take us to the thannah."—"Many of us would not work and were beat."—"We were beat when we did not work."—"If I did not work I was locked up and put in the stocks."—"I (a brahmin) experienced great trouble at Mauritius."—"Two days' pay were deducted for one day's leave."—"I was promised clothes every six months, but I only got annual clothing."—"If I was sick one day, two days' wages were cut."—"I was occasionally beat for not working."—"The work is hard even in the rains. The sirdar used to administer the blows by order of the overseer."—"We had hard work—we were made to work."—"If I was slow at work I used to get a slap on my posteriors with a cane," &c. &c. These incidental allusions will show the sort of treatment to which the Coolies were subjected in Mauritius; and may well create a grave suspicion of the mildness of the system said to have been pursued towards the Coolies by the Mauritian planters.

4. The last parliamentary document presented to Parliament, No. 43, 1841, contains, among other matters, minutes on the export of Coolies to Mauritius, drawn up by the Governor-general, W. W. Bird, H. T. Prinsep, and A. Amos, Esqrs., and a communication dated 15th February, 1841, from the colonial secretary at Mauritius, to the secretary to the government of India, embodying the sentiments of Sir Lionel Smith on the same subject. In this despatch his Excellency states, that the Coolies "have by no means been harshly dealt with, oppressed, or neglected; and he is quite satisfied that the interests of the planters themselves, and the intelligence of the Indians in the modes of ensuring redress of wrongs which they habitually enjoyed under the Company's servants in India, guarantee to them justice and good treatment from their employers in this island." To what are we to attribute this singular statement! To age and infirmity! The three things presented to our attention are the good treatment of the employers, the intelligence of the Coolies, and the habitual justice meted out to natives of India by the Company's servants! Why, we have as much faith in the one as in the other. If the poor Coolies have not a better guarantee for good treatment than this, we fear they will never get it! But Sir Lionel goes on to say, "he is quite satisfied that, with a government like this, powerful enough to enforce the Queen's commands, even the most ill-disposed planters in this colony, can be controlled against the exercise of arbitrary or unjust power." Then what becomes of his Excellency's experience in Jamaica! Is he stronger in Mauritius than he was in Jamaica! And what becomes of our experience of Mauritian honour, humanity, loyalty to the crown, and obedience to the laws? Sir Lionel is, we believe, stronger in confidence than in power, and he must pardon us when we say that even the pledge which he gives of his ability to keep the planters of Mauritius in order, is insufficient to convince us that he can do so, or that they are to be entrusted with the liberty and welfare of thousands of illiterate Hindoos. Mr. Amos, in his minute, observes, "I think it would be expedient to allow of the emigration of the natives of India to Ceylon, Mauritius, and Bourbon, under the following regulations. 1. The laws of these islands should provide for their protection during their period of contract, which should at first be limited, and for their return to India; and the possibility of these islands being made an entrepôt for the shipment of Coolies to more distant and less regulated places should be carefully guarded against. 2. Rules should be enacted, providing for the health and comfort of emigrants on board ship. 3. The enactment of severe penalties against crimping, which may be extended to Lascars, and which should include false representations, especially the use of the pretended authority of government. 4. Perhaps a register should be kept. It may appear presumptuous in us to differ in opinion from so learned a man as Mr. Amos, but we really think, that unless he go much farther than he states, his plan is a most inefficient one, and much less worthy of consideration than Mr. Grant's. Mr. Prinsep, the government secretary, "would not allow labourers to proceed at present beyond the Cape of Good Hope." He would require "that no labourer should be allowed to embark under contract for more than five years"—"a life contract should not be permitted, until we have full assurance that the labourer knows perfectly the kind of life, and labour, and the climate which he is binding himself to for ever." He would enact, "that whatever advances might be given as an inducement to embark, the labourer should not be bound for them after landing

in the colony of his destination ;" that "every ship licensed, should have an officer of customs on board to the time of sailing, to take account of the labourers shipped," &c. ; and that a "registry should be established." Mr. Princep, as well as Mr. Amos, would allow the Coolies to be taken to Bourbon. Mr. Bird entirely differs from these gentlemen, and would continue the prohibition for many good and sufficient reasons. In reference to the prohibition itself, he says, "It was not resolved upon until repeated attempts, by means of regulation, to check the abuses that were being committed had been made in vain ; and it is impossible, I think to doubt, after reading the evidence which has been adduced, that it is to this law alone we are indebted for a stop being put to a system of wholesale oppression, in which, with shame be it spoken, the police were deeply implicated, more disgraceful than any that the natives have experienced at the hands of Europeans in this country, for many years." He further observes—"The law, so far from being too stringent, would, I apprehend, have been of little use had it been less so, owing to the facilities which exist everywhere, for kidnapping and surreptitious shipment, whenever the temptation to practice it is sufficient to excite the cupidity of crimps and other miscreants who form the agency employed on such occasions." In replying to the objection that the prohibition interfered with spontaneous emigration, Mr. Bird says, "The disgraceful practices to which exporters have been obliged to resort, and of which, it must be supposed, they never would have been guilty, could the labourers have been procured by less exceptionable means, prove anything but that they go of their own free-will ; and it may be affirmed, that to travel beyond sea, even for the purpose of bettering their condition, is an undertaking to which the natives of India are but little addicted. Not a single complaint against the prohibition from any individual, except the exporters alluded to, has been made since the law was passed ; and as for the Hill Coolies, so little are they disposed to emigrate to places beyond the confines of India, that when we were desirous, not long ago, of procuring a number of them to work in the tea plantations of Assam, the local authorities who were employed to obtain them failed entirely, because of their unwillingness to go to a country of which they knew nothing, and their fears of being sent, as others had been from Calcutta, beyond sea." Mr. Bird then asserts, that the number of Coolies required by the Mauritians, cannot be "obtained by fair means," and that "the question really is, whether by any thing short of prohibition, due protection can be afforded to the bulk of the native population, or to expose, for the sake of a few, the most defenceless portion of the native population, from being involuntarily taken from their homes and their families, to promote European objects in foreign countries." He has no objection whatever to allow "those who possess skill and enterprise," the liberty of emigrating, and this may be done "by merely reserving to the local government the power of granting permission in such cases," but he contends that it is not necessary to allow of free emigration to the bulk of the population, and thus give rise "to a renewal of all the abominations from which, by the law in question, they have so recently been rescued." In conclusion, Mr. Bird observes, "I do not place much reliance on the testimony of the Coolies who have lately returned from Mauritius." . . . "I am not satisfied," he adds, "with the summary manner in which their examinations have been taken by the chief magistrate, who appears throughout in the character of a partizan arguing in favour of the Coolie trade." Finally, he recommends that in the event of such renewed emigration, care should be taken to guard against giving the least countenance to a prescriptive claim to our labourers. The planters, he says, "having once obtained permission to procure them, would doubtless demand compensation for the deterioration of their estates, were the privilege of exporting them at any time to be withdrawn." And, Mr. Bird might have added, that, whilst the planters are allowed to import any amount of adult labourers they please to cultivate their estates, they never will care for rearing a Creole peasantry, nor pay that attention to human happiness, and to the social, moral, and religious well-being of the people, which a wise and humane policy on the part of the home government, and especially which the benign principles of christianity render imperative on all who respect its claims.

The governor-general having also taken this important subject into consideration, gives a very qualified opinion on the expediency of re-opening the question of free-emigration as it is termed. His lordship candidly confesses that he has been led to no very satisfactory general conclusion upon it. However, he states that the law of prohibition "is most objectionable in principle ;" but he does not "believe that this law is yet felt as pressing hardly on the rights and interests of the natives of India." "It was," Lord Auckland remarks, "upon no understood practice, and only the busy intervention of an active agency, that the first emigrants were led to seek their fortunes in the Mauritius." To the perfectly voluntary emigration of industrious labourers his lordship has no objection, but in dealing with the particular case in hand, he feels great difficulty. He says, "Under ordinary circumstances, and if the slave trade and slavery had never been, we might, perhaps, approach the question of an open emigration with some hope of devising checks which might be relied on as generally effectual against abuse. But there is at present, in the sugar islands, a dearth of labour, which has so raised prices as to put in action every feeling of cupidity, with all the instruments by which labourers can be obtained. The number of labourers required is so great, that it could not be supplied by those

only who could calculate the advantage of the change. Even for the well-understood contracts of the soldier or the sailor, it is known into what tricks and acts of violence the low, sometimes the higher agents, is led ; and when for the supply of thousands and thousands of labourers to various remote settlements, the iniquitous craft of this great city (Calcutta,) finds its account in acting the crimp upon those who are simple and unguarded, I greatly fear that though amendment and caution, would no doubt come with time, *no strictness of regulation, and no vigilance on the part of the authorities, would immediately prevent the frequent infliction of grievous oppressions and deceits upon large numbers of persons helpless from their poverty, and from their utter ignorance and inexperience.*" This passage contrasts very remarkably with the complimentary statement of Sir Lionel Smith, before referred to. Lord Auckland must have smiled when he read it. And as for the protection which the natives enjoy from the police regulations of India, what must the condition of the lower class of the population be, when his lordship states in reference to the police itself, "*It is but too true that this branch of our service is most defective and ineffective, and the different experiments which have been tried for its reform, have ended in disappointment.*" The police may form an admirable body of agents for the Mauritian planters, but this confession, wrung from his lordship, proves that they cannot be trusted with the liberties of the people, and that justice, at all events, is not to be expected at their hands. Lord Auckland is willing, however, to try the experiment once more with Mauritius, and he states that "By the appointment of a distinct 'protector' of emigrants, by the inspection and limitation of contracts, by the prohibition of money advances, and by the regulation of shipping, and the other rules proposed, we might, I think do much ;" he says, "in the few ports from which emigration to the Mauritius might be limited, and for some stated number of emigrants, towards the entire suppression of the practices, of which three or four years ago there was too much reason to complain ;" and he adds, "we could at the same time always satisfy ourselves that the measures adopted in the Mauritius for the protection of the labourers when on the island, are operative and sufficient." In further elucidation of his sentiments, his lordship observes, "We must remember, however, that in permitting emigration to Mauritius, it would be necessary to guard against the possibility of labourers shipped nominally for that island being carried elsewhere, or their being inveigled while on the island into contracts of service in other settlements, where we could have no security for their treatment." His lordship is suspicious of Bourbon. He says, "We cannot expect that we shall be permitted to stock Mauritius with labourers without immediate facilities being again given by the French authorities for emigration to Bourbon," through the settlement at Pondicherry. Without guarantees for the "steady enforcement of measures of effectual precaution and protection within their settlements, Lord Auckland says, "I fear we should not be justified in re-opening emigration even to Mauritius." Whatever difficulty his lordship may have felt in speaking out upon this subject, we have no hesitation in saying, that it is our assured belief, that the Coolies who have been exported to Bourbon, are to all intents and purposes slaves, whatever they may be nominally, and that to allow of their farther export, to that island, would be neither less nor more than permission to carry on the slave-trade, of which British subjects would be the victims.

As a practical measure, Lord Auckland would so far relax the prohibition, as to permit the "skilful artizan, or the man of calculating enterprize," to emigrate. He would therefore adopt a regulation which should permit "ten or twenty such passengers, perhaps not more than one to twenty-five tons "to embark in vessels." A provision of this kind, would be open to none of the objections by which the adoption of a larger measure may be impeded, and it would take off its character of excessive and impolitic, if not unjust restraint, from the enactment as it at present stands.

With this concluding extract from Lord Auckland's minute, we bring our analysis of the parliamentary papers referred to in the opening paragraphs of this article to a close. We have taken pains to examine them minutely, and we have felt the importance of presenting their substance in a compact form to our readers, because after all the battle respecting Coolie emigration must be fought in England. Already the planters, and their agents in this country, have taken the field. Major Archer is home from the Mauritius, and has already advocated the scheme in a pamphlet, and in an insidious letter which has appeared in the columns of the *Times*. Mr. Grant is home. He is by far the most able and talented of their advocates, and on his exertions and influence with the government, the Mauritians greatly rely. Besides these gentlemen, there is the influential house of Barclay, Irving & Co., ever watchful, ever active to forward the interests of Mauritians, because their own is so completely bound up with them. We must counteract them. With us it must be a question not of emigration to Mauritius, or elsewhere, but of PROTECTION TO THE NATIVES OF INDIA. We must prevent their being sacrificed, nay, of their sacrificing themselves, to the all-devouring spirit of cupidity.

The following are extracts from the East India papers on the subject referred to in the preceding article :—

COOLIE EMIGRATION.

The *Eastern Star* holds forth an argument in favour of the Coolie trade, which we cannot suffer to pass without observation. The Mauritius planters have opened what our contemporary thinks "*must inevitably be a slave trade,*" and, therefore, he would permit (the so called) voluntary emigra-

tion of Indian labourers. We know that some heterodox moralists have urged that houses of ill fame ought to be tolerated in cities as a safety-valve for the licentious passions of the multitude, and consequently as a protection to the virtuous part of the female community. But we never yet heard it contended that because such houses are evils, the wives and daughters of the citizens should be given up to infamy, to prevent the necessity of permitting such establishments. But this is precisely the argument of the *Eastern Star*. The Mauritius planters will have labour at all events; they care not for the laws of God or man; felony and piracy are disregarded by them in the attainment of their object. Therefore, to prevent the renewal of these horrors, give up the inoffensive Indian labourer to the tender mercies of the kidnappers! We should have drawn an opposite conclusion from such premises. We do not accuse the planters of any wrong intention in their present attempt to procure labour; we have not facts before us to warrant an unfavourable conclusion. But had we grounds to believe with our contemporary that this is the commencement of a new slave trade, we should have felt ourselves furnished with the strongest possible argument in favour of existing restrictions. We should have said at once, these people cannot be trusted with the control of an ignorant and uncivilized race: they are themselves but half reclaimed. Like Robinson Crusoe's man, Friday, they have still the old hankering after human flesh, and every new attempt to obtain it ought to be a fresh caution to the legislature not to yield to their importunities.

One word as to *voluntary emigration*. Will any British journalist deliberately assert that these poor people understand the nature of the contract into which they enter, or of the service into which they are going? Those who have returned, are the few who have saved money; who are of course tolerably satisfied with the result, whatever they may have been with the course of their labours. Yet even these few assert that flogging is the usual practice to compel labour on the estates. We maintain, that whenever an employer has power to compel work by corporeal punishment, the labourer is a slave. It is useless to allege military service, for there the officer is in the place of the civil power of the state. Its authority is delegated to him for a special purpose, and by that purpose it is limited. But there is no more reason (except a slave code) why a planter should be permitted to flog his labourers than a householder in Calcutta should be permitted to flog the same labourers before their embarkation. Mr. M'Farlan, who cannot now see any great objection to the trade, would fine a master in Calcutta one hundred rupees for a few slight blows given in anger and under provocation. Yet he cannot see the objection to the cat of nine tails, when in the hands of the planter, where no means of redress can be obtained for the unfortunate labourer;—we were going to say—slave.—*Calcutta Englishman*, April 5th.

THE COOLIE TRADE.—It is with deep—nay the deepest regret, that we have learnt that Lord Auckland has by the last dispatch forwarded a minute to the Home authorities recommendatory of the Coolie trade. His lordship's career has been hitherto one marked by a succession of successful events, if not for the exchequer of the company, at least for the honour of Britain. We regret, therefore, that he should have recommended one single measure which strikes so effectually at the root of the liberty of our poor deluded fellow-subjects in India. We know not how far his lordship's opinion may have been formed on Mr. Grant's minute, with which the public have just been favoured. This minute is the most able document which has yet appeared on the subject, and had it been penned to recommend the emigration of the destitute at home, we should have said it is admirably calculated to convince gainsayers. It is this very feature in it however that we have to lament in the present instance. The conclusions and reasonings are admirable, but the premises are wrong. Mr. G. sets out by begging the whole question in debate, viz., by assuming that the Coolie does understand the nature of the engagement into which he is entering, and that the advocates for the suppression of the trade, with the best intentions, strike at the root of the principle they profess to defend—the liberty of the subject; nay, that they in effect say to the Coolie, you shall not go where you please. That the Coolie does not understand the nature of his engagement is admitted by *all*. We have never heard a dissenting voice on this point—he cannot; it is an impossibility in the nature of things. We may as well talk of Mr. Grant comprehending an engagement to have and hold lands in some particular districts of the moon. The Coolie knows as much—nay less of this world than Mr. G. or any other intelligent man does of the moon. That the friends of the Coolies have ever had the least wish to prevent their bettering their condition by removal to spots even more prophetic of good to them, we defy all the Coolie agents in the world to prove; but they have not been and cannot be convinced that to commit men helpless and ignorant into the hands of cunning and arbitrary men, the old slave proprietors of the Mauritius, is neither the way to improve their moral and physical good, or to secure their liberty. Did the Coolie know, was he aware of the true character of his future employers and employment, we know enough of him to say without the fear of contradiction that he would not go. The whole force of Mr. Grant's minute rests upon these two fallacies; therefore if they be disproved the whole of its reasoning and recommendations must fall to the ground. The writer has proceeded to Britain, and will doubtless recommend in person this new slave trade. This, together with the minute of the governor general, and the influence of the slavery party we fear will be but too likely to succeed. Our fears are great—our hopes small. Should the trade be sanctioned we shall see the British Parliament placed in one of the most extraordinary positions in which any legislature can be placed. With the one hand she has given twenty millions to remunerate the sugar planters from any prospective losses arising out of the emancipation measure; while with the other she is, in answer to the demands of these very so remunerated planters, about to allow them to carry off a race of people, who will labour for them under the name of free men for slave wages, to the great injury of the emancipated negro; and the new slaves:—with the one hand she is sending out an expedition at a cost of £20,000 to civilize Africa with a view to the suppression of slavery all over the world; while with the other, she is peopling her colonies under legal sanction with a new order of slavery. The battle must now be fought in Britain.—*Christian Advocate*, April 24th.

TEXAS is rapidly advancing in the cultivation of cotton. Last year she made 50,000 bales. This year her crop is estimated at from 100,000 to 200,000 bales. This country will in a few years produce very large crops of cotton, as both the soil and climate are well fitted for the purpose of growing the article.

CUBA.

Our valued correspondent in this island has sent us some highly important information, in the following letter to the Secretary of the Anti-slavery Committee.

Havana, September 1st, 1841.

Sir,—To speak of public opinion in a country where the iron hand of censorship restrains every form of expression to which the press can give utterance, will seem to an English reader to savour of absurdity. It is nevertheless an undoubted fact, that within the last few months, under the administration of a captain-general who is far from being distinguished for the lenity with which he administers his all but absolute authority, opinions and sentiments which have long been slumbering in the bosoms of our native population have gradually assumed a palpable form; and, thanks to your kind assistance in giving publicity to my former letters, and to the important documents which some of them contained, a great many of those who distrusted their neighbours and hesitated to avow their sentiments have gradually acquired that degree of confidence, or courage, which makes a man ashamed to dissemble his convictions.

It was just about the time when our memorials came back from London in a printed form, that intelligence arrived also from Madrid, which has since leaked out through some friends to the cause in the public offices, that a demand had been made by the British government on that of Spain, for the immediate emancipation of all such slaves as had been introduced into this island since the date of the first of the existing treaties between the two crowns. The government of Madrid have so far evinced a disposition to yield to this new demand of the British government, as to have required the captain-general to procure and transmit to Madrid the necessary statistical information from the various corporations of the island, from the magistrates and local functionaries, and even, it appears, from private individuals. This concession has been made at a moment peculiarly favourable for leading to important results. In the meantime it serves to strike the leading slave-dealers with dread, and to encourage the hearts of the friends of humanity. I do not mean to say that all those who hail the approach of the suppression of the African slave-trade are animated exclusively by sentiments of humanity. A large proportion of them, on the contrary, would be glad to maintain the practice of simple slavery, as they call it, for at least another generation. But there are very few of the leading Creole proprietors of slaves who would not willingly, and even gladly, accede to a compromise, which a few months ago would in London have excited a smile of incredulity. This compromise would embrace the instant and effectual suppression of all future importations of slaves, and certainly would not ask for more than a lifehold possession of what they now call their property.

A new feature has recently presented itself in the practice of the slave-trade in this part of the world. There being no longer any consul or agent of Portugal in the Spanish West Indies, the traders to the coast of Africa are unable to clear out their vessels under the Portuguese flag, and, as the assumption of that of Spain is attended with several inconveniences, a considerable number of these vessels, not less than seven or eight, have left this harbour within the last three months completely equipped for their criminal destination without assuming any nationality, or being provided with a certificate of registry, or other papers to prove it.

For several years the slave-traders had been accustomed to rely more on the superior sailing qualities of their ships than on the means of forcible resistance to the attempts of our cruisers to capture them. Of late, however, they appear to be returning to their old system of numerous crews and powerful armaments. Before this letter reaches you, the English public will, doubtless, have heard of the destruction of the boats of one of our cruisers, in the attempt to cut out the brig *Irene*, a notorious slaver belonging to this port—near the mouth of the river Gallinas, on the coast of Africa; and it is not improbable that this instance of successful resistance will encourage these desperados in returning to the pugnacious system which they formerly pursued.

One thing appears to be clear, however, that whether we are to persevere in our fruitless endeavours to put down the slave-trade by force of arms, or to trust for its extinction to mere moral means, the system at present pursued is eminently unworthy of the power of our nation on the one hand, and of the philanthropy of the age on the other. If the plan of physical force is to be persevered in, it ought surely to be made more effective than it now is. In the course of the present year, the visits of her Majesty's ships to this coast have, indeed, been few, and far between. If they do occasionally touch at the Havana, it is merely in passing from one British settlement to another to obtain supplies of water and other necessaries. In fact, the responsibility which is thrown on a naval commander in the event of the ultimate acquittal of his prize, has a strong tendency to damp his zeal in the discharge of this branch of his duties.

If the courts of mixed commission are to be maintained at the various stations where they now exist, and are even to be extended, as appears to be the intention of government, judging from the recent treaty with Buenos Ayres, you must pardon me for suggesting, that it is peculiarly your duty to watch over the selection of the individuals of which these tribunals are to consist.

The parliamentary papers make it clear, that one at least of the British judges at Rio de Janeiro has been selected without any reference to his opinions or his practice on the subject of slaveholding; and in some of my former letters, which I rejoice to find

have met your approbation, it has become my painful duty to call your attention to the pro-slavery habits of more than one of the members or dependents of the court at Havana.

But it is not enough that a man appointed to such a station should simply abstain from the commission of the crime he has been appointed to suppress. The true ground of his selection ought to be his eminent fitness for the post to which he has been named, for it certainly does not require any great powers of mind to perform the duties of a commissary judge, or a commissioner of arbitration. If the person appointed is firmly resolved to devote himself to the suppression of the traffic, that resolution should go far to supply the want of other qualifications.

Unhappily for the cause of humanity, these nominations have hitherto been the mere result of political convenience. The present crisis, however, appears to present an opportunity peculiarly favourable for the abatement of such abuses. Two great parties in the state are bidding against each other for the favour of the people of England. It is no part of my business to question the sincerity of either, in their professions of zeal for the suppression of the slave-trade. Had the whigs remained in power, they would have been compelled, in defence of the position in which they had placed themselves with reference to the sugar duties, to have made some great effort for the effectual suppression of the slave-trade, which the introduction of slave grown sugar was so directly calculated to promote. On the other hand, as the advent of the conservatives to power appears to be the immediate result of the defeat of the late whig government on this branch of the free-trade question, the times appear to the Cuba abolitionists to be singularly favourable for spurring the existing administration, whether Whig or Tory, to promote by all possible means, the accomplishment of the object we have all so nearly at heart. Give us, they say, at least good men and true in the court of mixed commission, if for no other reason, at least to prove that the English people, and the English government, are heartily sincere in their desire to carry out the avowed principles of the existing treaties. A fat sinecure like that of commissary judge in one of the most luxurious capitals in the world, may prove as convenient a sop for some conservative seat holder in the new parliament, as it was a few years ago to the radical member for Tiverton. The political opinions of the judges, are in my mind, of no importance at all, but it is of the very last importance that they should not even be suspected of apathy or indifference on the very subject as to which they are naturally supposed, by the people among whom they reside, to represent, not merely the views of the British government, but the opinions and sentiments of British abolitionists. If the judges are suspected of indifference, you may rest assured that the people and the government who sent them will share in the same opinion, and that is a state of things which is exceedingly unfavourable to the promotion of that movement in favour of freedom which, in former letters, I have had the satisfaction to be able to announce to you.

Among our naval men, I find it currently reported, that the *Romney* receiving ship is about to be removed to Jamaica; but I sincerely hope that this will prove to be a mistake, arising from the known anxiety repeatedly expressed by the commissioners in the parliamentary papers to bring about an object in which, if they were successful, they would, without being aware of it, be going far to efface that sort of prestige which attaches, not only to the *Romney*, but to the court itself, of which they are members.

J. H. Tredgold, Esq.

SLAVERY IN BRAZIL.

To the Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*.

London, 10th Month 17th, 1841.

SIR,—I herewith send a continuation of the series of questions commenced in my last, with the answers of the highly respectable individuals therein mentioned, who had more than ordinary means of acquiring the necessary information. The queries already sent related to the treatment of slaves; those which I now transcribe, to the slave-trade.

Does the government of Brazil derive, directly or indirectly, any benefit from the slave-trade?—"No direct revenue. Indirectly it derives a certain return from the duty of fifteen per cent., levied on all goods re-exported to the coast of Africa from Brazil. This duty was first imposed in 1837, as a check on the slave-trader. Of late clearance has been refused to vessels for the coast of Africa; hence the resort to Hamburgheze, Swedish, Oriental, and other flags."

Thus far only my informant dwells on this question. I, however, am enabled to state, that the refusal of clearance, which evidently extends to Brazilian vessels only, is but a specious deception; for the merchants residing in Brazil principally use the Portuguese flag to cover their iniquitous proceedings. The following sample of a list which I collected of two hundred and forty voyages of slavers from the city of Rio de Janeiro alone, from 1836 to 1840 inclusive, will clearly prove that the government are fully aware, that refusing clearances to their vessels (an occasional act) neither impedes the trade, nor hinders their merchants from engaging in it; it will further show that, the fifteen per cent. on the exports to Africa, as a prohibitory duty, is, in point of fact, but a sinister method of deriving a revenue from the slave-trade, and that that duty is merely transferred from the imported slave to the exported property by which they are to be purchased.

Description of Slaver.		Sailed from Rio.		Return Voyage.		Conduct of Government.			
Name of Slaver.	Flag.	To what place.	Month. Year.	Month. Year.	Actual Cargo.	Ostensible Cargo.	Put Vessel in Quarantine.	Seized Vessel.	Released Vessel.
Dons Irmaes.	Portuguese	Angola.	9 mo. 16, 1836	4 mo. 10, 1837	580 slaves at Dois Rios, Ilha Grande. 580 slaves at Campos.	Wax, oil, and mate. Wax, oil, and ballast. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do.	4 mo. 22.	4 mo. 25.	5 mo. 2.
Do.		Do.	6 mo. 9, 1837	4 mo. 22, 1838			3 mo. 14.	3 mo. 19.	3 mo. 21.
Do.		Cabinda.	8 mo. 28, 1838	3 mo. 14, 1839			2 mo. 1.	2 mo. 6.	2 mo. 11.
Do.		Quilmane.	7 mo. 21, 1839	4 mo. 1, 1840			4 mo. 6.	10 mo. 19.	Date not traced.
Doze d'Outubro.		Do.	6 mo. 12, 1836	4 mo. 5, 1836			Do.	Do.	Do.
Do.		Do.	11 mo. 26, 1836	10 mo. 19, 1836			Do.	Do.	Do.
Do.		Do.	7 mo. 8, 1837	4 mo. 23, 1837			Do.	Do.	Do.
Do.		Angola.	4 mo. 18, 1838	1 mo. 9, 1838			Do.	Do.	Do.
Do.		Mozambique.	11 mo. 3, 1838	3 mo. 28, 1839			3 mo. 28.	1 mo. 1.	10 mo. 3.
Do.		Angola.	5 mo. 8, 1839	12 mo. 22, 1839			12 mo. 22.	12 mo. 28.	4 mo. 4.
Dons d'Avril.	Portuguese	Angola.	4 mo. 23, 1837	1 mo. 13, 1837	{ 403 slaves at Colonel Vasco's, Fort St. Iago. These slaves were landed in broad day-light. 263 slaves at Dois Rios, Ilha Grande. 283 slaves at Cope Cabana. 339 slaves at Dois Rios, Ilha Grande. Captured by British cruisers on the coast of Africa.	Do.	12 mo. 16.	12 mo. 26.	12 mo. 28.
Do.		Do.	3 mo. 8, 1838	9 mo. 17, 1838			9 mo. 17.	9 mo. 21.	9 mo. 24.
Do.		Zaire.	12 mo. 24, 1838	7 mo. 20, 1839			7 mo. 20.	7 mo. 25.	7 mo. 27.
Do.		Angola.	12 mo. 4, 1839						

The number of slaves landed, and the place of debarkation, I have copied from the official letters of the British charge d'affaires to our secretary of state, as contained in the parliamentary papers; and the other particulars from the returns of the Brazilian custom-house, and the reports of the courts of justice in that empire. The concentration of these documents in the form above shewn, exposes the lamentable fact, that the government of Brazil connives at the slave-trade, by which it gains 15 per cent. But this would not be a sure revenue to that government, if it did not also wink at

the peculation of the public officers concerned, who, from the prime minister to the lowest policeman, are proportionately interested in it. Indeed I was informed by the Portuguese minister, that "a regular tariff of fees is kept, according to the tonnage of the slave vessel, for the different public officers."

From other quarters I ascertained that public officers high in rank were not only in receipt of fees, but engaged in the traffic. For instance, the present chief officer of the custom-house, who was some time previous to his appointment to that office a prominent anti-slavery advocate, is now hand in glove with the slave traders, accepts bribes, and has an estate where he sends the newly imported slaves which he, by such fraudulent practices, receives.

Again, early in 1841, many new negroes which were about to be surreptitiously landed in canoes, were seized and lodged in the marine arsenal. The government, on being informed of the circumstance, directed the law officer of the crown to appoint a committee to inspect them, and report whether they were newly imported Africans or ladinos (trained slaves). The actual owners of the cargo were nominated, and the new Africans were, as might be expected, declared to be ladinos, and consequently delivered up to the man-stealers as lawful slaves.

Again, the Marquis of Barbacena, whilst he was negotiating with our ministry in 1837 on the subject of the abolition of slavery, and, with plausible declaration persuading them of his sincere desire to promote it, was at the same time actually purchasing large supplies of newly imported slaves, as was also his eldest son, the viscount. This last individual is opening, by the means of some of these unfortunate beings, a gold mine at Brocoloo, near Gongo Soco, avowedly for the purpose of selling it to some English mining company. He, the son, is a cruel slave owner, and, as he told me, a member of the *London Peace Society*!

The induction from the whole of the above positions is, that the slave-trade, nominally abolished in 1831, is still encouraged by the Brazilian government and their public officers; that the duties of the former are secured on the exports, the fees of the latter on their power to enforce the abolition law, should the slave-trader refuse to pay or endeavour to cheat. Hence the apparent vigilance and nominal seizures in the foregoing list; and, although it is said "there is honour amongst thieves, yet it appears that they sometimes endeavour to defraud each other; but, nevertheless, they settle their differences amongst themselves, and, united by the common cause of self-interest still remain on strictest terms of amity."

Before I close my letter, I desire to refer to the statement in my return, that slaves were landed at Colonel Vasco's depository, some even in the broad day-light; and that a vast portion of the slaves imported into Rico, are landed under the guns at that fort, of which he is the commandant. I visited the fort and the depository, and know that it is impossible, without the connivance of the military, that such occurrences could happen. My visit was noticed in the public papers as follows:—

"Another insult to the national dignity. Some English recently disembarked without ceremony on an estate, and proceeded to interrogate the individual in charge, and some of the slaves, as to whether Africans were commonly disembarked there. Not satisfied with the result of this inquiry, they proceeded to a rigorous search; and after these insults retired. We will not make any observations on this: our indignation carries us much farther than we care to say. Suffice it to narrate the fact; and certainly none who have in their veins one drop of Brazilian blood, or in their heart one sentiment of justice, can fail to feel as we feel; or to unite with us in supplicating the minister of foreign affairs, that at least, this, the greatest of the insults which we have borne with evangelical resignation, shall not remain unpunished."

Happily the treaty of commerce is about to expire which we have made with this piratical nation, execrated by all the nations which her selfishness and insolence have offended. And we desire to see, if there will be found in Brazil a man to put his hand to new contracts with the British government. We have borne enough!" *O Brazil, 1st of May, 1841.*

I have only to add that the editor of this paper is the notorious slave dealer and ex-minister Vasconcelles.—I remain your's very truly,
GEORGE PILKINGTON.

TEXAS.

IMPORTANT intelligence has come to hand respecting this would-be republic. We give in the first place an extract from the *Morning Herald*.

The reports which have been current in the United States papers for some time past, of a commencing disposition on the part of Mexico to entertain propositions for the acknowledgment of the independence of Texas and the conclusion of peace, are far from being borne out by the tenor of the advices now received by the Mexican packet. The following copy of a note of the Mexican minister in reply to the formal offer of mediation between the contending parties has been received by this occasion, and is a subject of conversation in the higher diplomatic circles. Although otherwise exclusively remitted to this department of the *Herald*, there is no question that the Mexican legation must also be in possession of a copy of the document.

"TO THE MINISTER OF WAR AND MARINE.
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN RELATIONS.

"Excellent Sir,—To-day I have written to his Excellency the plenipotentiary of her Britannic Majesty the letter of which a copy follows. The undersigned minister of foreign relations has had the honour to receive the communication of his Excellency Senor Don Ricardo Paken-

ham, of this day's date, in which he is pleased to advise him of the arrival at Vera Cruz of a Texan commissioner, charged with propositions to the supreme government for the arrangement of the existing differences between Mexico and that department, expressing the ardent desire of the British government that the present opportunity should not be neglected for concluding it on honourable and advantageous terms. Having laid before the president of the republic this communication, so that he should be pleased to decide on what was convenient in a matter apparently so grave, his Excellency, after a mature and lengthened consideration, has signified his desire that I should reply to Senor Pakenham, as I have the honour now to do, that the government of Mexico has had no motives for a change of opinion in appreciating the question of Texas, when it replied to, on this same affair, the note of Senor Pakenham, and gave instructions for the note to the effect, which was addressed to him by the minister on the 11th of December, 1839. Notwithstanding this conviction, his Excellency the president esteems as it merits the friendly solicitude of the British government to bring to a peaceful termination this question, and deeply regrets not to be able to comply with his ardent desires to accomplish it; but his Excellency the president has found it impossible to deviate from the principles of honour and justice which forbid him from consenting to the dismemberment of the republic, and sanction the act of most notorious ingratitude with which it was possible to correspond to a magnanimous and generous nation, by the usurpation of those rich and fertile lands where it bestowed all its hospitality towards those who came to beg it like mendicants. Besides, Senor Pakenham is not ignorant that, since the department of Texas rose in insurrection, the insurgents have introduced and continue introducing innumerable slaves, whose traffic horrifies humanity, and for which cause alone, even were there no others, the Mexican republic and its government can never lend itself to an act EQUIVALENT TO THE SANCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SLAVERY. The undersigned has the honour, &c. And I have the honour to hand you a copy for your government and convenient occasions. God and liberty. Mexico, June 8th, of 1841.

"SEBASTIAN CAMACHO.

"To his Excellency the Minister of War."

Besides this despatch, our correspondent advises, as a well-known fact in Tampico, that General Don Mariano Arista, commander-in-chief of the army of the north destined for the invasion of Texas, had received a strong letter of remonstrance and reproof on the 13th of August, for having received and entertained the Texan envoys provisionally, as it might lead to unfounded expectations that the acknowledgment of Texan independence was at least in debate and a possible event, whilst at the same time it afforded the Texan agents facilities for acquiring information as to the strength and positions of the army, and of the more assailable points of the frontier, as well as for entering into communication with such disaffected parties as in a newly-constituted state like Mexico are always to be found. The words of this despatch, not over agreeable to General Arista, as quoted are—*Prescindiendo de las noticias que el enemigo debe adquirir por medio de tales agentes acerca de las fuerzas con que V. S. cuenta para hacer la guerra, de los recursos que estan á su disposicion, de las diversas posiciones que guardan sus tropas, de las distancias á que se hallan situadas, y de la disposicion de los habitantes de esa frontera en que por desgracia no faltan algunos desnaturalizados Mexicanos, &c.*: the president in view of such grave objections could not approve General Arista's reception of the Texan agents, &c., as before said.

The important documents and information of the most authentic nature now first communicated to the public, establish the fact of the absolute refusal of Mexico to entertain the question of Texan independence, and of the resolution of the government to attempt the reduction of Texas to its dominion. It will not fail to be observed how strong and peculiar is the objection emphatically placed in the foreground, to recognise the new republic. That ground is the existence of slavery tolerated by Texan laws and the atrocious traffic in slaves openly connived at by the ruling authorities. Now the abolition of slavery and the prohibition of the slave-trade are among the most stringent and imperative articles of the Mexican constitution, carried out too in practice with the most scrupulous and uncompromising as honourable fidelity. One of the greatest, although for political reasons unmentionable, grievances of the Texan colonists, was the rigour with which the Mexican government enforced the laws against slavery, and sought to extinguish the nefarious traffic and importation of slaves into Texas from and between the bordering states of the American Union. By the recognition of Texas, therefore, the sincerity of Lord Palmerston's apparent hostility to the slave-trade was very much questioned in Mexico, and it must be confessed that the act is certainly justificatory of the suspicion to a great extent. It remains to be seen what Mr. Kennedy, the special champion of Texas in this country, may have to urge further in vindication of his favourite republic. The reasoning by which, in his ably written work on Texas, he has attempted to estimate the abomination of the toleration and the existence of slavery there, is by no means such as can be accepted as conclusive in a christian country, and above all in a country which, like this, has made such prodigious and unparalleled sacrifices in money, and more than money's worth, for the extinction or erasure of this accursed plague-spot from the fair face of modern civilisation. Eminently faithful to her principles and obligations, Mexico, it will be seen, is resolved honourably to persevere to the end in wiping out the disgrace of slavery in her dominions at whatever cost, and a ruinous cost it must be for a country just emerging from a long continuance of internal dissensions and civil war.

To this account we add the following letter from a Spanish merchant in Tepic, given in the *Morning Chronicle*.

Tepic, 19th July, 1841.

"Trade along these coasts is very much depressed on account of the abundance of goods, and the scandalous contrabands which are perpetrated. In a political sense we are in a bad position, but the aurora of a better day brightens upon us, because the idea has become general that our system of finance requires a total reform, carried to the extent of extinguishing all motive for and profit in clandestine introduction of goods, and that the constitution itself requires to be revised, with the view of reconciling the centralist and federal party, of satisfying the alterations required by the dissentients of Yucatan and Tabasco, and of establishing a popular, united, and strong government.

"The only thing wanting to carry into effect this reform is, that some one of our military chiefs of reputation should proclaim himself the leader

